

Buddhist Monastic Discipline

JOTIYA DHIRASEKERA

(Now Bhikkhu Dhammavihari)

Buddhist Monastic Discipline

A study of its origin and development in relation to the
Sutta and Vinaya Pitakas

Jotiya Dhirasekera

Editor - in - Chief, Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Sri Lanka.

*Formerly of the Department of Pali and Buddhist
Civilization, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya
and the Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies,
University of Toronto, Canada.*

Ministry of Higher Education Research Publication Series, Sri Lanka.

*Vinayo nāma Buddhasāsanassa āyu
vinaye ṭhite sāsanaṃ ṭhitaṃ hoti*

As long as the respect for law and order is maintained so
long shall the word of the Buddha prevail.

Indebtedness of the author to the Ministry of Higher
Education for the publication of this work is gratefully
acknowledged.

Buddhist Monastic Discipline

Thesis submitted to the University of Ceylon for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

First Edition

Printed in Sri Lanka in 1982 by M.D.Gunasena & Co.
(Printers) Ltd., Colombo 12.

878-2 / 79

Preface

The Vinaya which is a part of the system of training for the Buddhist disciple is a subject of absorbing interest not only for the study of Buddhist monasticism but also for the study of Buddhism as a whole. This is particularly true of Theravada Buddhism where the practice of monastic life as a means of attaining the religious goal is held in great esteem. Dr. Robert H. Thouless has made a thoroughly accurate assessment of this position as early as 1940. He says: 'Perhaps the feature of Buddhism with which the modern Western mind finds it hardest to sympathize is its monastic character. The achievement of emancipation was regarded as a full-time occupation incompatible with the preoccupation of a man living in the world. It is true that householders might become disciples of the Buddha. These were required to abstain from taking life, drinking intoxicating liquors, lying, stealing, and unchastity, and also aim at pleasant speech, kindness, temperance, consideration for others, and love. By obeying these injunctions laymen might hope to advance so far that their future state would be a happier one. It is even suggested in one discourse that a householder might obtain full release, but it is clear that this was regarded as exceptional; the fruits of the Buddhist

Preface to the Second Edition

discipline could normally be achieved only by the monk who gave all his time to the task.¹

Nevertheless, it is our belief that the subject has not received the attention it deserves. The present work attempts to assess the role of the monk in the religion which is the outcome of the teachings of the Buddha. There were monks in India, no doubt, even before the time of the Buddha. But the first sermon which the Buddha delivered to the 'Group of Five' monks made the Buddhist monks appear somewhat different from the rest of their kind. His views about life in Saṃsāra and the escape therefrom, his aesthetic sensibility, and his regard for sound public opinion contributed to emphasise these differences. Thus in Buddhist monasticism the life of the cloister is not an end in itself. It marks only the beginning of the pursuit of the goal. It is a long way before the monk could claim to have reached that worthy ideal: *anuppattasadattho*. It has been our endeavour to show that Buddhist Monastic Discipline covers this vast and extensive field.

¹ Conventionalization and Assimilation in Religious Movements in Social Psychology with special reference to the development of Buddhism and Christianity, p. 24, *Riddell Memorial Lectures*, Twelfth Series, O.U.P. London, 1940

Preface to the Second Edition

I wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues and friends who have been of assistance to me at various stages in the course of this work.

Jotiya Dhirasekera
University Park, Peradeniya, Ceylon
1 October 1964

At this stage of publication the need for further comments on the subject matter of this thesis is not felt. It is to be reiterated, however, that any meaningful living of the monastic life in Buddhism has to accord with the spirit of both the Dhamma and the Vinaya.

Jotiya Dhirasekera
Encyclopaedia of Buddhism
135, Dharmapala Mawatha
Colombo 7
5 November 1981

Preface to the Second Edition

I now write this preface to the second edition of my Buddhist Monastic Discipline as a Buddhist monk of fifteen years' standing, having renounced the life in the household on retirement at the age of sixty-eight. More than thirty-nine years have passed since the production of this thesis and I still continue pursuing my studies on the Vinaya. I have seen and read several subsequent publications on the subject. This is neither the time nor the place to make any observations on them.

I wish to place my own findings and my observations on the subject before students of Buddhist monastic life in particular, and students of Buddhism in general, specially those who have missed seeing my work in the earlier edition and those who I believe are not adequately familiar with the original Vinaya texts in their Pali version.

Mention must be made of Venerable Mettavihari of Denmark and Venerable Pamburana Sanghasobhana who assisted me in diverse ways in the production of the manuscript of this second edition for the printer. My thanks go to Messrs. P.W. Dayananda and B.D.Jayasena who did the typing of the text.

Preface to the Second Edition

I wish to express my deep gratitude and appreciation to the Director and the authorities of the Buddhist Cultural Centre, Anderson Road, Nedimala, Sri Lanka for kindly agreeing to bring out this second edition of Buddhist Monastic Discipline.

Bhikkhu Dhammavihari

International Buddhist Research and Information Center

380/ 9 Sarana Road, Off Bauddhaloka Mawatha

Colombo 7, Sri Lanka

5 November 2005

Table Of Contents

Preface	v
Preface to the Second Edition	viii
Table Of Contents	x
Abbreviations	xii
CHAPTER I Introduction	1
CHAPTER II Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality	66
CHAPTER III The Early Buddhist Ideal of The Monk	106
CHAPTER IV The Foundations of Monastic Life: Sīla, Sikkhā and Sikkhāpada	139
CHAPTER V Further Aids to Monastic Perfection	180
CHAPTER VI The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism	202
CHAPTER VII The Discipline and Development of the Mind	221
CHAPTER VIII The Codified Law of the Saṅgha	254
CHAPTER IX The Ritual of the Pātimokkha	304
CHAPTER X Penalties and Punishments	362

Abbreviations

CHAPTER XI Additional Punitive Regulations	395
CHAPTER XII Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community	429
CHAPTER XIII Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha	460
CHAPTER XIV The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis	495
Pārājika	499
Saṅghādisesa	505
Nissaggiya Pācittiya	508
Pācittiya	510
Pāṭidesaniya	517
Sekhiya dhamma.	518
The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha	518
APPENDIX I The Exclusion of Guilty Monks From The Recital of the Pātimokkha	529
APPENDIX II The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training	546
APPENDIX III The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development	570
Bibliography	590
I. ORIGINAL SOURCES	590
II SECONDARY AUTHORITIES	596
Index	599

Abbreviations

A.	Aṅguttara Nikāya
AA.	Aṅguttara Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Manorathapūraṇī
AAS.	Ānanda Āśrama Series
Ap.	Apadāna
Brh.	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Chānd.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
Comy.	Commentary
D.	Dīgha Nikāya
DA.	Dīgha Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī
Dhp.	Dhammapada
DhA.	Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā
DhsA.	Dhammasaṅgaṇī Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Atthasālinī
Gilgit MSS	Gilgit Manuscripts
IHQ.	Indian Historical Quarterly
Ind. Ant.	Indian Antiquary
J.	Jātaka
Kaṭha.	Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Kkvt.	Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī, i.e. Pātimokkha Aṭṭhakathā
M.	Majjhima Nikāya
MA.	Majjhima Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Papañcasūdanī

Abbreviations

Māṇḍ.	Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad
Manu.	Manusmṛti
Miln.	Milindapañha
Muṇḍ.	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad
Praśna.	Praśna Upaniṣad
PTS.	Pali Text Society
Pts.	Paṭisambhidāmagga
S.	Samyutta Nikāya
SA.	Samyutta Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā i.e. Sāratthappakāsinī
SBB.	Sacred Books of the Buddhists
SBE.	Sacred Books of the East
Sn.	Suttanipāta
SnA.	Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakathā
Taisho	Taisho Issaikyo
Tait.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Thag.	Theragāthā
Thig.	Therīgāthā
Ud.	Udāna
UdA.	Udāna Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Paramatthadīpanī
Vibh.	Vibhaṅga
Vimt.	Vimativinodanī Vinaya Ṭīkā
Vin.	Vinaya Piṭaka
VinA.	Vinaya Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. Samantapāsādikā

Abbreviations

Vinvi. Vinayavinicchaya

Vism. Visuddhimagga

Buddhist Monastic Discipline

CHAPTER I

Introduction

It is well to begin a study of Buddhist monasticism with a brief reference to religious mendicancy in India in general. Both these are by no means unexplored fields of study and have engaged the attention of scholars for nearly a century. Among the more successful and recognised of these we would not fail to mention Max Muller, Monier Williams, Oldenberg, Rhys Davids, Mrs. Rhys Davids, E.J.Thomas, Nalinaksha Dutt, Miss I.B. Horner and Sukumar Dutt. The pioneers among them started their work during the last few decades of the 19th century and worked on relatively scanty material. However, we are glad to note that in our evaluation of their results, we have found some of these scholars of distant antiquity to be extremely reliable and trustworthy. Admittedly, they tried to work with perfect detachment but it cannot always be said, perhaps due to forces beyond their control, that they were free from bias of some sort or another.

We have attempted in the present study to analyse and examine such lapses wherever possible. It is our conviction that, barring the paucity of source material at a particular time, the following considerations contributed in some way or other to the origin and perpetuation of several erroneous theories:

(i) An unnecessary attempt to force into one single genealogical tree many institutions of diverse origin. This is particularly true in the case of some scholars who begin their study of Indian religions from the Vedic schools and trace it down chronologically through the centuries. Here is Monier Williams attempting to see Buddhism in relation to Brahmanism: 'We perceive again the close connexion between Brahmanism and Buddhism; for clearly the Brahmacārī and Sannyāsī of the one became the Srāmaṇera or junior monk, and Sramaṇa or senior monk of the other.'¹ But this is an unfortunate identification which is far from the truth. The Pali works keep the *brahmacarya* of the Brahmins distinctly apart from their own [*brahmacariya*]. In the Suttanipāta it is said that the orthodox Brahmins of old practised the life of *brahmacariya* for forty-eight years.

¹ Monier Williams, *Buddhism.*, p.75.

*Aṭṭhacattālīsaṃ vassāni komārabrahmacariyaṃ carimṃsu
te
vijjācaraṇapariyeṭṭhiṃ acaruṃ brāhmaṇā pure.*

Sn.v.289

The Aṅguttara Nikāya too, expresses a similar idea.¹ This distinction between the *brahmacariya* life of the Buddhist disciple and that of the Brahmins is clearly maintained by an independent observer in the person of King Pasenadi Kosala in the Dhammacetiya Sutta.² [*Idhā'haṃ bhante passāmi eke samaṇabrāhmaṇe pariyantakataṃ brahmacariyaṃ carante dasa'pi vassāni vīsatiṃ'pi vassāni tiṃsam'pi vassāni cattārīsaṃ'pi vassāni. Te aparena samayena sunhātā... pañcahi kāmagaṇehi samaṅgībhūtā paricārenti.* M.II.120.]

(ii) An inadequate knowledge of Pali, the language in which one of the most reliable recensions of Buddhist texts is preserved. Some of the pioneers very naturally stumbled over in many places in their translations, mainly through their ignorance of the peculiarities of idiom. Greater disaster befell Pali studies when later scholars who followed in their wake placed implicit faith on the earlier translations and built far-

¹ A.III.224.

² M.II.120.

reaching theories on them. A very glaring instance of this is found in S.Dutt's reliance on Chalmers' translation of the Gopakamoggallāna sutta.¹ It is also possible to trace other instances of incorrect translations which result more from biased thinking than from ignorance. Here are two such cases picked up at random:

(a) *Bhavissanti dhammassa aññātāro* (Vin.I.21; M.I.163.) translated as: 'Some when they learn will become (*i.e.* will grow).'²

It simply means: 'There would be some who would understand the doctrine.'

(b) *Ariyassa vinaye yo accayam accayato disvā yathādhammaṃ paṭikaroti... āyatim samvaram āpajjati*³ - translated as: 'In these Rules laid down by the Venerable One,

¹ See S. Dutt, Buddha And Five After-Centuries, p.66 and Further Dialogues, II. SBB.VI.p.160.

² Given by Mrs. Rhys Davids as occurring at *Vinaya Texts*, SBE. XIII (edition not given), p.112. [See her *Outlines of Buddhism*, p.74 where she has made use of this translation.]. But the 1881 edition of the text which we have used has the following translation which we consider to be reliably accurate : 'They will understand the doctrine.'

³ For the correct and complete quotation see D.I.85; M.I.440; Vin.I.315.

he who realises his lapse to be such and remedies it according to law, obtains absolution at once.'¹

Here, not only is this translation incorrect but the quotation itself is badly mutilated. The words *vuddhi hi esā* should be prefixed to the quotation. The translation should then read as follows:

'It is a sign of progress in this noble discipline if one realizes his lapse to be such and remedies it according to law and safeguards against its repetition in the future.'

(iii) An unwarranted disregard for the subsequent commentarial traditions which merit more serious consideration.

It should be made quite clear that we do not make a plea here on behalf of the Pali Commentaries that they should be used as the sole criteria in the interpretation of Canonical texts. Far from it. But our contention is that more often than not, when Commentaries have been subject to criticism and ridicule, they have been misjudged and misinterpreted. We come across instances when modern scholars accuse commentators of being ignorant of etymology.² But it is obviously unreasonable to imagine that every commentarial explanation of a word either

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.85.

² *Ibid.*p.72.

had to be or was thought by the commentators to be an etymological one. It would certainly amount to fighting wind-mills to mock a commentator at a definition like *saṃsāre bhayaṃ ikkhatīti bhikkhu*.¹ This is by no means born of ignorance of etymology. Commentarial tradition is equally conversant with the definition *bhikkhatīti bhikkhu*.² And there are numerous other definitions of *bhikkhu*.³

This commentarial trend is much more evident in the numerous definitions that have been successively added on to the word Pātimokkha. All these go to prove the fact that the commentarial tradition which legitimately goes back to the early days of the Sāsana, even as far back as the time of the Buddha, did acquire in its long history a wealth of information which is invaluable in the study and interpretation of Buddhist ideas and institutions. Such information reveals something dynamic in their evolution. The connotations of words and the values attached to them are seen changing in course of time.

It would be interesting to study the various definitions of Pātimokkha in the light of these observations. In the

¹ Vism.I.3.

² Vibh.245.

³ Ibid.245-46.

Mahāvagga, in what is called the Old Commentary by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, we have perhaps what may be regarded as the oldest definition of Pātimokkha: *Pātimokkhan'ti ādiṃ etaṃ mukhaṃ etaṃ pamukhaṃ etaṃ kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ*.¹ One would search in vain here for an etymological definition. But one cannot ignore the light it throws on the scope and function of the Pātimokkha in the early history of the Sāsana. It is said to be the beginning, the source of all good activities. We have shown elsewhere how the Pātimokkha which began as a complement to *sīla* in early Buddhist monasticism soon came to be regarded as *sīla* par excellence. Thus we discover their identification in the Commentaries [*Pātimokkhasaṃvaro eva hi sīlaṃ* - MA.I.155; SA.III.230.]. The cultivation and acquisition of virtue (*kusalā dhammā*) was the main concern of the monastic life² and soon the Pātimokkha came to be the sole guide in Buddhist monasticism for the attainment of this ideal. Hence, even in the Canonical texts, *sampannapātimokkha* or the perfection in terms of the Pātimokkha becomes a necessary adjunct of a *sīlasaṃpanna* or one who is perfected in *sīla*.

¹ Vin.I.103.

² M.II.11. lists it under the four *sammappadhāna*. Ibid.pp.95, 128 list it under the five *padhāniyaṅga*.

We are well aware of the fact that the spiritual earnestness of early Buddhist monasticism soon receded into the background. In its place, the slower process of perfection through saṃsāric evolution, subject to birth in good and evil states (*sugati* and *duggati*), came to the fore and gained greater prominence. This tended, to a certain degree, even to secularize the monastic ideal. It came to be that the reward for the religious life of the monk differed from that of the layman only in the matter of degree. They both shared a life of bliss in heaven, the monk excelling the layman with regard to his complexion, glory and life-span.

*Nave deve passantā vaṇṇavanto yasassino
sugatasmim̐ brahmacariyaṃ caritvāna idhāgate.
Te aññe atirocanti vaṇṇena yasaṣāyuna
sāvakā bhūripaññassa visesū'pagatā idha.*

D.II.208.

However, there is no doubt that this was viewed as a departure towards something inferior. In the Aṅguttara Nikāya, the Buddha gives these same items of divine excellence as a cause for revulsion for those who seek the true fruits of recluseship [*Sace vo bhikkhave aññatitthiyā paribbājakā evaṃ puccheyyumaṃ devalokū'papattiyā āvuso samaṇe gotame brahmacariyaṃ vussatīti nanu tumhe bhikkhave evaṃ puṭṭhā*

aṭṭiyeyyātha harāyeyyātha jiguccheyyāthā'ti. Evam bhante - A.I.115.].

Some did, in fact, rebel against it. Evidence of this, though with a different emphasis, is found in the Commentary to the story of the Samaṇa Devaputta of the Saṃyutta Nikāya who, due to no choice of his, found himself born in the heavenly world [*So chāyaṃ disvā cutibhāvaṃ ñatvā na mayā imaṃ ṭhānaṃ patthetvā samaṇadhammo kato. Uttamatthaṃ arahattaṃ patthetvā kato'ti sampattiyā vippaṭisārī ahoṣi. SA.I.86.*]. At this stage we are not surprised at the following definition of Pātimokkha given by Buddhaghosa: *Yaṃ taṃ atimokkhaṃ atipamokkhaṃ uttamasīlaṃ pāti vā sugatibhayehi makkheti duggatibhayehi, yo vā naṃ pāti taṃ makkhetī'ti pātimokkhan'ti vuccati.*¹

Apart from the new emphasis which is laid on the scope of the Pātimokkha, one thing stands out clearly in this definition of Buddhaghosa. Buddhaghosa is conscious of the paramount importance of the Pātimokkha as a body of sīla: it is the atimokkhaṃ atipamokkhaṃ uttamasīlaṃ. Nevertheless, it is now valued more for its efficacy in warding off from and guarding against the possible dangers of sugati and duggati. It

¹ DA.II.479

is the security of the life after death that is now sought. Yet another thing strikes us here. Whatever may be the purpose for which the Pātimokkha is used, the Commentator seems to be aware of the fact that the primary idea associated with the Pātimokkha is that of freeing, liberating and saving. It is as though he knows that the verbal notion in the word Pātimokkha is derived from the root/*muc*, giving such verb forms like *muccati*, *muñcati*, *moceti* which have the idea of free, release or liberate.

In the present study of monastic discipline we use the word 'monastic' primarily in the sense of 'pertaining to or characteristic of monks, nuns, friars and the like.' Any reference to monasteries is made only secondarily in association with the former. As a prelude to such a study three things should be viewed clearly in order that the problems of Buddhist monastic discipline may be analysed in their proper context.

They are:

- (a) Pre- Buddhist religious mendicancy in India.
- (b) Origins of Buddhist monasticism.
- (c) Origins of Vinaya literature.

Extensive work has admittedly been done in all these fields of study. Very definite ideas have been expressed on many

problems connected with them. Nevertheless, we feel that there are numerous instances where modification and reconsideration of views already expressed is not only desirable but absolutely essential.

A great deal has been said about religious mendicancy in India before the advent of Buddhism. As early as 1889, Monier Williams said the following on the subject:

‘Monasticism had always been a favourite adjunct of the Brahmanical system, and respect for monastic life had taken deep root among the people... Hindu monks, therefore, were numerous before Buddhism. They belonged to various sects, and took various vows of self-torture, of silence, of fasting, of poverty, of mendicancy, of celibacy, of abandoning caste, rank, wife and family. Accordingly they had various names... Such names prove that asceticism was an ancient institution.’¹

These remarks of Monier Williams about pre-Buddhist mendicancy are also borne out by the evidence of the Pali texts.² Oldenberg gives a very vivid account of the pre-Buddhist origin of Indian monasticism.³ Sukumar Dutt makes a

¹ Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, pp.74-75.

² M.I.80, 82, 237f; Ud.65.

³ Oldenberg, *Buddha*, pp.60-70.

very comprehensive study of the origin of *śramaṇa* in India in a chapter entitled 'The Primitive Parivrājaka - A Theory Of Their Origin'.¹ He has refreshingly new and interesting views to express regarding their origin. It would be out of place in the present study to quote these authorities at length on the history of pre-Buddhist religious mendicants. Suffice it to say that all evidence points to the wide prevalence and respectful acceptance of religious mendicancy in ancient India prior to the birth of Buddhism, and that what was most noteworthy about it was the diversity rather than the homogeneity of its character.

On the origins of Buddhist monasticism much more markedly divergent theories have been put forward since the beginning of this century. One of the distinguished pioneers in the field of Buddhist studies, Professor Rhys Davids, expressed the following view about Buddhist monasticism at a date as early as 1886.²

'It was a logical conclusion from the views of life held by Gotama, that any rapid progress in spiritual life was only

¹ S.Dutt, *Ealy Buddhist Monachism*, pp.30-56.

² Rhys Davids, *Buddhism* (Non-Christian Religious Systems) 1886, p.152. *Note:* This is a revised edition and is the earliest edition available to us.

compatible with a retired life, in which all such contact with the world as would tend to create earthly excitement and desires should be reduced as much as possible; and accordingly, from the first he not only adopted such a mode of life for himself, but urged it on his more earnest disciples.¹

In 1912 he was joined by his wife, Mrs. C.A.F. Rhys, in expressing the same view. In the unrevised editions of her *Buddhism* in the Home University Library series (pre-1934) she says the following about Buddhist monasticism:

‘The monastic habit or practice of seclusion in the wild, common to Indian recluship from time immemorial, and probably imported from India to Egypt and so to the newly Christianized Europe, was largely and systematically practiced by Buddhists. It was both practiced by the founder himself, and recommended to the followers, as the best opportunity for cultivating detachment, spiritual calm, and thoroughgoing meditation on any given subject prescribed by the recluse's superior.’²

¹ Even the reprint which was made 26 years afterwards of this learned treatise has not witnessed a change of his view. See 1912 ed. p.152.

² Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, (Home University Library) 1912 ed.p.204.

After a thorough analysis of the evidence of the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas we feel that this explanation of Buddhist monasticism is indisputably correct. The motive in renunciation as given here could not be any more near the truth.

But we lament the fact that, supported by her new discovery of 'the growing vogue of the cenobitic monk and his peculiar ideals', Mrs. Rhys Davids abandoned her early ideas about Buddhist monasticism expressed earlier.¹ In her *Outlines of Buddhism* published in 1934 she shows her new attitude to monasticism in Buddhism:

'I believe, that for the founder of Buddhism and their co-workers the business of the missionary was the main pre-occupation, and that, effectively to carry on this, it was necessary to give up the life 'of the world' as a tie which would nullify the worth in their work in religion. People would not have listened to the gospel taught by one who was sharing their life. He had to show that that gospel was the one thing in the world which mattered.'²

¹ See Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism* (Revised edition, 1934), p.198f.

² Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism*, p.63. See her *Buddhism*, (1934 ed.) p.201.

This is a very strange motive which is ascribed here to the *pabbajita*. This is as it were to show that *pabbajjā* and the life of *brahmacariya* have nothing in common. Mrs. Rhys Davids goes a step further. She undertakes the formidable task of simplifying, or oversimplifying we should say, the concept of *brahmacariya* in Buddhism. Of *brahmacariya* in Buddhism she says:

‘It paraphrases Dharma as perfect conduct, in a word hitherto used for the life of a student under his teacher, resembling to some extent the life of a medieval youth in a collegiate cloister, but now applied to life as the ‘many-folk’ might live if they chose to.’¹

But this popularized rendering of the meaning of *brahmacariya* when it comes to Buddhism, unlike in the *Caturāśrama Dharma*, seems to be hardly justifiable except on the assumption that Buddhism, in its origin, was a religion for the ‘many-folk’. In a chapter devoted entirely to this subject of *brahmacariya*, we show why we prefer to hold a different point of view on the evidence of the Pali texts (See Ch. III.). For the present we would place before the reader a very different

¹ Ibid. p.75.

evaluation of the life of *pabbajjā* and its relation to the practice of *brahmacariya* as given by Miss Horner:

‘For one of the points of entering Gotama's Order was to learn control of body, mind and speech. This, it was thought, was essential to spiritual progress, and was extremely hard to attain unless the shackles of the household life had been laid aside. Then man, as monk, could more readily attain perfection and its fruit (*arahattaphala*), the goal of *brahmacariya*, the good, divine, holy or Brahma-life.’¹

These remarks, whatever may be the interpretation of Brahma-life, savour truly of the contents of the early Nikāyas.

Monier Williams who completed his treatise on Buddhism in 1880 has made the following remarks on the origins of the Buddhist Saṅgha:

‘What ought rather to be claimed for him (Buddha) is that he was the first to establish a universal brotherhood (Saṅgha) of coenobite monks, open to all persons of all ranks. In other words, he was the founder of what may be called a kind of universal monastic communism (for Buddhist monks never as a rule, lived alone), and the first to affirm that true enlightenment - the knowledge of the highest path leading to saintship - was not

¹ Miss Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, I. pp.xviii.

confined to the Brahmans, but open to all the members of all castes.¹

He adds further:

‘The peculiarity about Gotama's teaching in regard to monachism was that he discouraged solitary asceticism, severe austerities, and irrevocable vows, though he enjoined moral restraint in celibate fraternities, conformity to rules of discipline, upright conduct, and confession to each other.’²

These observations of Monier Williams both with regard to the origins of Buddhist monasticism and the pattern of the consequent organization, we would regard as being commendably thorough and accurate. However, there is one single point on which we would like to seek further clarification. He says that Buddhist monks never, as a rule, lived alone. It is difficult for us to determine the evidence on which he arrived at this conclusion. Judging by his evident familiarity with the Vinaya texts, we wonder whether it is the apparent compulsory residence under a teacher for a prescribed period of time which is in the tradition of the Vinaya which led him to this remark. But we should observe here that the Vinaya itself gives many

¹ Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, p.72.

² Ibid.

exceptions to this general practice.¹ At the same time, forest-dwelling, solitary monks were as much a feature of early Buddhism as the resident, urban monks who lived in communities. This is the burden of the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta of the Suttanipāta. This aspect of Buddhist monastic life is discussed at greater length elsewhere (See Chs. VII & XII).

On the other hand, Dr. Sukumar Dutt, obsessed as it were with the idea of itinerant mendicancy which he derives from the life of Parivrājakas, seems to be unable to conceive of any settled life in the early Buddhist community of Bhikkhus. Of their life he says: 'in its original condition of homeless wandering'.² Was not the Buddha himself, even prior to his enlightenment, sufficiently acquainted with settled community life among his contemporaries who had renounced the household life? The institutions of Ālāra Kālāma, Uddaka Rāmaputta, Sañjaya and the three Kassapa brothers, all point to the existence of well settled communities of 'homeless men'. Such settled life did not come to be tabooed in Buddhism, either early or late. Itinerancy was not a compulsory injunction and was never implied in the Buddhist ideal of *agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajati*. As we have pointed out elsewhere, it came to be adopted by some through

¹ Vin.I.80f.

² S. Dutt, *Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.61.

personal preference, but this does not in any case imply any general change of attitude in Buddhist monasticism.

Life in the community and life in seclusion were undoubtedly in existence side by side even during the earliest phase of the Sāsana. But to affirm this is not to lose sight of the fact that both monasteries and community life in them grew in stature in the centuries that followed the establishment of the Sāsana.

In support of his theory of the exclusive eremetical ideal of early Buddhism, Dutt quotes the Mahāvagga statement *mā ekena dve agamittha* which he translates very correctly as 'let not two of you go one and the same way'.¹ But we are surprised to find him use this statement thereafter to conclude that 'the Buddha insists on unsocial life in its extreme form.' Dutt seems to lose sight completely of the historical setting in which the remark was made by the Buddha. It was the Buddha's philanthropy and magnanimity which made him dispatch his first

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.91. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg too translate it as 'Let not two of you go the same way' at *Vinaya Texts I*, SBE. XIII (1881), p.112. But Mrs. Rhys Davids quotes SBE.XIII (edition not given) as translating this statement as 'Go not singly but in pairs.' (See *Outlines of Buddhism*, p.74.). Neither the grammar of this sentence nor the spirit in which it was made would allow us to accept this latter translation.

band of sixty disciples who were of reliably good character to wander about in the country and the town for the weal and welfare of many. He wanted his message to reach as wide a circle as possible and he was confident of the calibre of his disciples. That is what made him say the above, that no two disciples should go in the same direction. In those pioneering days of the Sāsana it would have been a tragic waste of man power to do so when every one of the disciples so dispatched was equal to the task. We would refer the reader here to the thoroughly accurate explanation which Miss Horner has given to the above injunction of the Buddha:

" These are the grandiloquent words which have come down to us. It is more likely that Gotama said something like 'Go out now to the villages near by, and as there are so few of you, no two of you should go by the same way. Speak of the new ideas that I have just been telling you about to any one who will listen'."¹

Having postulated that the Buddhist Bhikkhus formed a sect of the Indian Parivrājaka community,² Dutt associates, *ipso facto*, an exclusive eremetical ideal with the early Buddhist

¹ Miss Horner, *Women Under Primitive Buddhism*, p.115.

² S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.113.

Bhikkhus. But he seems to run into a number of references in the Canonical Pali texts which differentiate the Bhikkhus from Parivrājakas. As these obviously are contrary to his supposition he chooses to regard them as being of later origin.¹ It is difficult to detect the criteria which Dutt uses in underrating the evidence of some portions of the Pali texts as being unhistorical. The Gopakamoggallāna Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya clearly does not support his theory of the early Buddhist eremetical ideal. He thinks this Sutta is unhistorical in its narrative contents.²

The solitary, retiring type of Bhikkhu who loved a life of peace and quiet and who for that purpose even penetrated into the forest depths was by no means the exclusive pattern of early Buddhist monasticism. While the great elders like Mahā Kassapa were respected as champions of this way of life, monks who lived in an urban setting (*gāmantavihārī*) have won as much praise for their spiritual earnestness. (*Evam eva kho āvuso yassa kassaci bhikkhuno ime pāpakā icchāvacaṛā pahīnā dissanti c'eva suyyanti ca kiñcā'pi so hoti gāmantavihārī nemantaniko gahapaticīvaradharo atha kho naṃ sabrahmacārī sakkaronti garukaronti mānenti pūjenti. Taṃ kissa hetu. Te hi*

¹ Ibid. p.110. n.84. and *Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.109. n.1.

² S. Dutt, *Buddha And Five After - Centuries*, p.66.

tassa āyasmato pāpakā akusalā icchāvacarā pahīnā dissanti c'eva sūyanti cā'ti - M.I.31). In the Gulissāni Sutta, the venerable Sāriputta shows us that the forest-dwelling monk needs as much to develop his virtue as the monk who lives in the village.¹

Both groups seem to have been known at a very early date and it also appears that their venue of residence was no major concern. In marked contrast to Mahā Kassapa, Sāriputta and Moggallāna mingled with their fellow brethren in large communities and worked for their uplift.²

Dutt also tells us that "the counterpart in practice of the 'rhinoceros' ideal is represented by the formula of the Four Resources (nissaya) of a Bhikkhu."³ Elsewhere he says the same in the following words: "The eremetical ideal indicated here - a life of solitude and austerity - is that recommended in

¹ M.I.469f.

² M.I.24f, 95f.

³ S.Dutt, *Buddha And Five after-Centuries*, p.69. The word *nissaya* is used to refer to the minimum requirements of a Bhikkhu on which he depends and subsists. They include food (*piṇḍapāta*), clothing (*cīvara*), shelter (*senāsana*) and medicaments (*gilānapaccaya-bhesajja-parikkhāra*) and are referred to as the Four Nissayas (*cattāro nissayā*). See Vin.I.58.

the so -called Four Nissayas.¹ Neither the nature of these Nissayas nor the incident which is said to have prompted the announcement of these make us believe that they have anything in common with the solitary ideal of the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta. They only constitute a sound attitude of mind towards the life of pabbajjā. They refer to the four requisites (catupaccaya) which a Bhikkhu expects to receive from the laymen. It is of paramount importance that a Bhikkhu who chooses on his own a life of renunciation should be able to live that life, without discontent, on the simplest of requisites which he would receive from others. The virtue which is aimed at in this idea of the Nissayas is contentment. In a desire for more and better requisites the pabbajita shall not let a spirit of discontent overpower him and embitter him about his religious life. That is the warning struck in the admonition on the Nissayas: *Tattha te yāvajīvaṃ ussāho karaṇīyo*.² It means 'In that holy way of living you should continue to strive all your life.'

Dutt's remarks on the Nissayas show signs of unnecessary distortion. He says: 'When a person has already been ordained as a Bhikkhu, an almsman professing to live for the rest of his life on alms, he is thus reminded in a formal exhortation of the

¹ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.92.

² Vin.I.58.

other three nissayas, supposed to be the other resources of his mendicant life.¹ He appears to derive the idea that a Bhikkhu is 'an almsman professing to live for the rest of his life on alms' perhaps from the expression of the first Nissaya in the form 'Piṇḍiyālopabhojanam nissāya pabbajjā'. But we do not see any justification for it. Nor do we feel warranted to make such a statement on the purely etymological definition of the word bhikkhu (*bhikkhatīti bhikkhu*).

This concept of the Bhikkhu as indicated by Dutt is obviously in the tradition of Devadatta who requested the Buddha to lay it down that a Bhikkhu should live on begged food all his life (*sādhū bhante bhikkhū ... yāvajīvam piṇḍapātikā assu - Vin.III.171*). Dutt goes even so far as to think that Devadatta's request to make rigid, lifelong habits of certain recommendations which also include the Nissayas was an unsuccessful attempt at reviving the old eremetical ideal.² But what Devadatta attempted was more to toe the line with the champions of severe austerity, for Devadatta himself states that people generally have a greater regard for austerity in religious life - *lūkhappasannā hi manussā*. But whether Devadatta did this out of genuine respect for austerity, or as the Vinaya texts

¹ S.Dutt, *Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.96.

² S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.96.

put it, out of the sinister motive of discrediting the Buddha and his Order in the eyes of the people because the Buddha denounced severe austerities, is a different problem. As Dutt himself points out, Devadatta's proposals accord more with Jaina practices.¹ In Buddhism, they strike a discordant note and consequently Devadatta appears more a dissident than a revivalist. Dutt is apparently sorry that 'Devadatta got no credit for enjoining strictness with regard to some of them.'² But for very obvious reasons we are certainly not.

Dutt's historical sense has also led him to develop an evolutionary theory with regard to the concept of Cātuddisa Saṅgha. He begins by saying that "the word Saṅgha signified later on not the whole body of Buddhist 'Bhikkhus of the Four Quarters', but only a particular cenobitical society resident at an āvāsa."³ Elsewhere he is even more categorical about the use of the word Cātuddisa Bhikkhu-saṅgha. He says: 'The primitive Buddhist Saṅgha in Pali literature is designated by its founder the *Cātuddisa Bhikkhu-saṅgha*.'⁴ This identification of 'the primitive Buddhist Saṅgha' with the Cātuddisa Bhikkhu-saṅgha,

¹ Ibid.p.95.n.23.

² S.Dutt, *Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.70.

³ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.13.

⁴ Ibid. p.67.

in our opinion, is hardly justifiable. The *Cātuddisa Bhikkhu-saṅgha*, in the context in which it occurs, did not represent a distinct group as such. It implied, on the other hand, the bestowal of gifts to the 'Order as a collective organization'. The phrase was used in such context, from the earliest times, connoting the totality of the Saṅgha. This undoubtedly was more a theoretical reckoning than a physical reality and was used for purposes of monastic administration, particularly in the acceptance and ownership of property. We reproduce below in full the instances cited by Dutt where the word Cātuddisa Saṅgha is used:

D.I.145 *Yo kho brāhmaṇa cātuddisaṃ saṅghaṃ uddissa
vihāraṃ karoti....*

Vin.I.305 *Yaṃ tattha garubhaṇḍaṃ garuparikkhāraṃ tam
āgatānāgatassa cātuddisassa saṅghassa
avissajjikam āvebhaṅgikan'ti.*

Vin.II.147 *Rājagahako seṭṭhi bhagavato paṭissutvā te saṭṭhiṃ
vihāre āgatānāgatassa cātuddisassa saṅghassa
paṭiṭṭhāpesi.*

Vin.II.164 *Tena hi tvaṃ gahapati jetavanam āgatānāgata-
cātuddisassa saṅghassa patitthāpehīti.*

It should be clear from a study of the above statements that where the Buddha uses the word *cātuddisa* (of the four quarters) with reference to the Saṅgha, he does so for the specific purpose of enjoining the collective acceptance of gifts in the name of the Saṅgha in its totality. This is further clarified by the additional word *āgatānāgata* (those present and not present) which is sometimes used with the former implying that the physical presence of every member is not necessary at such a bestowal although the right of use of property so bestowed is shared by every member of the Saṅgha. In the light of these observations we are unable to agree with the following statements of Dutt:

1. The persistency with which the expression is used in reference to the primitive Buddhist Saṅgha seems to indicate that it was used originally not as descriptive phrase merely, but as a name.¹

¹ Ibid.pp.67-68.

2. In the Vinaya Piṭaka and in Ceylonese inscriptions dating back to the time of Asoka, it is used in contexts where no special signification of universality is intended.¹
3. The Saṅgha of the Four Quarters meant latterly an ideal confederation, which at one time had an historical reality.²

If we examine the Rādha Brāhmaṇa episode of the Mahāvagga³ we see a very early stage in the evolution of monastic administration. The right of admitting new converts to the monastic order through a formal resolution before the Saṅgha is introduced here for the first time. This was done by the Buddha himself to avoid the possible abuse of power by individuals to whom he had already relegated the authority which he once held. In this transference of power from individuals to a corporation we see the recognition of the existence of such separate bodies which carried the designation of Saṅgha. They were real and active institutions which had a local relevance. One would not deny that this instance of empowering Saṅghas for the conferment of Upasampadā is relatively early in the history of the Sāsana.

¹ Ibid.p.68.

² Ibid.p.69.

³ Vin.I.56.

Nevertheless one cannot confuse the Saṅgha who thus acts collectively at these monastic functions with the Cātuddisa Saṅgha, a concept which connotes something very different. These independent groups of Saṅgha, to begin with, were not necessarily residents of one single *āvāsa* or monastic residence.¹ Sometimes the residents within a single village unit formed one Saṅgha as is evident from details of the Pātimokkha recital which is referred to in the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta.²

We shall now turn our attention to what has been said so far about the organization and discipline of this early monastic community. As early as 1880 Rhys Davids and Oldenberg jointly expressed the following view: 'It seems to us that Gotama's disciples, from the very beginning, were much more than a free and unformal union of men held together merely through this common reverence for their Master, and through a common spiritual aim. They formed rather, and from the first, an organised Brotherhood.'³

¹ See S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.13.

² M.III.10.

³ *Vinaya Texts* I. SBE. XIII. xii.

Speaking of the Buddhist monastic fraternity Oldenberg says: 'It appears from the very beginning to have been a society governed by law. The completion of a procedure prescribed by law was necessary to the reception of a postulant into the society. The law of the Order pointed out to him his course of action and of omission. The society itself as a court of discipline secured conformity to the ecclesiastical rules by keeping up a regular judicial procedure.'¹

Based on independent observations we are in a position to say that what has been stated in both cases is thoroughly accurate. Let us now turn to Sukumar Dutt.

'It is unhistorical to presume that the entire corpus of the laws the Vinaya Piṭaka was drawn up at one time. From the beginning we hear of persons in the Buddhist Saṅgha, called Vinayadharas, who concerned themselves with the study and exposition of the rules of the Vinaya. The existence of such professors was the surest guarantee for conservation and consolidation of the laws from generation to generation among the Buddhist Bhikkhus.'²

¹ Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p.331.

² S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.13.

We are glad to say that these words too, constitute very sound observation. Note here Dutt's admission of the early existence of Vinayadharas in the Saṅgha and 'the study and exposition of the rules of the Vinaya'. He proceeds thereafter to strike a note of warning against possible lapses in this field of study.

'Through an inadequate appreciation of the complexities of the study, even learned writers on Buddhism have been betrayed into attributing to the historical Buddha rules and regulation of his Order, most of which did not emanate from him, but were adopted by his monk-followers from time to time under the aegis of the Founder's name.'¹

When and where these criticisms apply, we will leave the reader to judge. But where Dutt expresses his own ideas about the origins of Vinaya rules he seems to be obviously on slippery ground. Speaking of the role of the Buddha in the Vinaya Piṭaka he says:

'He is therefore set up rather as a judge than as a law-maker. He pronounces on the validity of acts done by the

¹ Ibid.p.29.

Bhikkhus and does not profess to prescribe general courses of conduct for them.¹

We feel that his remarks here are mixed up with a bit of legal jargon and they obviously miss the mark. As has been explained in detail elsewhere under the origin of *sīla* and *sikkhāpada*,² the Buddha does not proceed as a law-maker, without any provocation. This is clearly stated to be so by the Buddha himself both in the Bhaddāli Sutta³ and the Suttavibhaṅga.⁴ Judgement on a single wrong act done by a Bhikkhu marks the birth of a new rule. Nothing is further from the truth than his remark that the Buddha does not profess to prescribe general courses of conduct for the Bhikkhus. Here Dutt seems to fail to assess correctly the role of the Vinaya *sikkhāpada*. They are unmistakably generalisations based on specific instances. Collectively they determine the general course of conduct for the monks.

Whatever be the evidence of the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas, Dutt seems to have reached the conclusion that the Vinaya is a

¹ Ibid.p.23.

² See Ch.IV.

³ M.I.445.

⁴ Vin.III.9f.

very late product in the Sāsana. But some of his remarks at times seem to contradict his own theory. We examine below some of his major postulates. He begins his argument regarding the origin of Buddhist Vinaya as follows:

‘Each of these sects had a *Dhamma*, a body of doctrines, of its own, but whether it had an equally defined *Vinaya*, a special body of external rules, is another question which we shall deal with in Chapter III.¹

In Chapter III which is referred to here, he makes the following analysis:

‘Considering this episode ... the conclusion is irresistible that the idea of the primitive Buddhist community was that the Buddha himself had laid down no *regula* for the Saṅgha. The seeming inconsistency in the Buddha's saying later on in the same Suttanta "*Yo vo Ananda mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito*," etc.... vanishes if we regard Vinaya in this context as not signifying the rules of an Order, but those of right conduct.²

But we are sorry to say, with all due deference to Dutt's critical attitude, we are not in a position to concede this manner of historical reconstruction which is based on misconceptions

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.36.

² *Ibid.* p.65.

and is exceedingly misleading. Let us examine these statements more closely. The episode he speaks of refers to a statement said to have been made by the Buddha to Ananda. It reads as *Tathāgatassa kho ānanda na evaṃ hoti ahaṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ pariharissāmi'ti. Kiṃ ānanda tathāgato bhikkhusaṅghaṃ ārabha kiñcid'eva udāharissati.*¹

Based on this, Dutt says that `the Buddha refused to lay down any rule for the Saṅgha.² But to say this is no more than an act of wishful thinking, for by no stretch of imagination can we find any such idea in the above statement which is ascribed to the Buddha. Therefore we would call this the first false move of Dutt in consequence of which he ventures to ascribe to the primitive Buddhist community an idea which would historically be most unsound, viz. that the Buddha himself had laid down no *regula* for the Saṅgha. It has been pointed out elsewhere that the cry came from more than one quarter of the Buddhist Saṅgha that the Buddha was laying down too many rules.³ The

¹ D.II.100.

² S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.65.

³ *Evaṃ eva pana udāyi idh'ekacce moghapurisā idaṃ pajahathā'ti mayā vuccamānā te evam āhaṃsu. Kim pan'imassa appamattakassa oramattakassa. adhisallikhatevā'yam samaṇo'ti* - M.I.449.

Ko nu kho bhante hetu ko paccayo yena pubbe appatarāni c'eva

first assumption of Dutt has led him to his second error of judgement where he suggests a new meaning to the word Vinaya in the quotation *Yo vo ānanda mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito paññatto...* Note his remarks here: `... if we regard the Vinaya in this context as not signifying the rules of an Order, but those of right conduct.'

Now we should point out that it is hardly fair that Dutt leaves out of his quotation the word *paññatto* which appears just after *desito* in the above statement. This, in effect, would be a distortion, for the word *paññatto* has a specific ring of codified law, and the word *paññatti* is used throughout the Vinaya Piṭaka with reference to the promulgation of rules of discipline. Further, Dutt himself does not fail to mention the fact that these remarks were made by the Buddha during his last missionary tour.¹ In

sikkhāpadāni ahesum bahutarā ca bhikkhū aññāya saṅghaḥimsu. Ko pana bhante hetu ko paccayo yena etarahi bahutarāni c'eva sikkhāpadāni honti appatarā ca bhikkhū aññāya saṅghahantī'ti -
M.I.445. See also S.II.224.

Yo pana bhikkhu pātimokkhe uddissamāne evam vadeyya kiṃ pana imehi khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi yāvad'eva kukkucāya vihesāya vilekhāya samvattantī'ti sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake pācittiyaṃ - Vin.IV.143.

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.64.

numerous sections of Canonical texts which can legitimately claim great antiquity the words *dhamma* and *vinaya* are used ascribing to both, as it were, equal prestige and importance. One only needs to analyse such statements as the following to be acquainted with such usage.

āgatā'gamā dhammadharā vinayadharā mātikādharā

D.II.125; M.I.223.

ayaṃ dhammo ayaṃ vinayo idaṃ satthusāsanam

D.II.124; A.IV.143,280.

abhidhamme vinetum abhivinaye vinetum - Vin.I.64.

abhidhamme abhivinaye yogo karaṇīyo - M.I.472.

What justification is there then for regarding 'Vinaya in this context' as something very different from what it usually is in the references to Dhamma and Vinaya? Are we here called upon to imagine that the Vinaya in the last days of the Master was something much more diminutive than during his life time? Or are we expected to be so critical as to reject every other reference which does not support our hypothesis as being unhistorical and unacceptable?

Thus having set the stage according to his own inclinations, Dutt proceeds to build up his own theory as follows:

`There is no reason to suppose that the Buddhist Parivrājakas, who called themselves Bhikkhus did not abide by them. It seems, on the other hand, as the legend of Subhadda would seem to suggest, that the Buddha had enjoined strictness with regard to them. The followers of the great Teacher obeyed these rules of Parivrājaka life, as presumably did the other Parivrājakas.¹

We do not deny that the background of Buddhism did influence to some extent the evolution of the Buddhist Vinaya. But this interpretation of Subhadda's words is certainly far-fetched and appears to be calculated to support a pre-conceived notion. Dutt makes several bold attempts to establish this idea and makes several new interpretations of passages too well known. Note the obvious contradiction in what Dutt says about the proceedings of the First Council: `In other words, its main object was to collect the rules of right conduct for the Bhikkhus which had been laid down by the Buddha at various times and, by giving them an authoritative Buddhist stamp, to convert them into special rules of the Buddhist Order.² If on his own admission the Buddha had laid down at various times rules of right conduct for the Bhikkhus, the

¹ Ibid.p.66.

² Ibid.p.67.

question arises what then is the need to give them an authoritative Buddhist stamp? What of the redundant conversion into special rules of the Buddhist Order? How do we dismiss the references which point to the early existence of Vinayadharas? Many such problems would be reviewed in the course of this study.

We would now consider the evolution of the Vinaya literature which is preserved to us in the Pali Tipiṭaka. There too, on many problems, one discovers a diversity of opinion. Before we enter into any controversy we would like to name the works which are recognised as the contents of the Canonical Vinaya Piṭaka. They are:

Pātimokkha (Bhikkhu and Bhikkhunī)

Vibhaṅga or Suttavibhaṅga

(Mahāvibhaṅga and Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga)

Khandhaka (Mahāvagga and Cullavagga)

Parivāra.

In our present study we do not undertake any serious study of the Parivāra as it does not make a really worthwhile contribution to the problems of monastic discipline. Considering the vital role of the Pātimokkha in Buddhist monasticism we would choose to begin our discussion with what has been said about the Pātimokkha. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg say:

`It (Pātimokkha) is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, of the Buddhist text- books; and it has been inserted in its entirety into the first part of the Vinaya, the Vibhaṅga.¹

As a result of extensive investigations made into early monastic history we are unable to concede the use of the description 'oldest text-book' with reference to the Pātimokkha. By Pātimokkha we mean the code of bare rules, without any details regarding the rules. Judging by the nature and function of the early ritual of Pātimokkha in Buddhist monasticism we are convinced that if anything served as a text-book in the early days of the Sāsana, it should certainly be the Suttavibhaṅga, though not necessarily in the present form, yet as something more than the Pātimokkha itself. Evidence in support of this view is examined in detail in a succeeding chapter (See Ch. VIII).

Oldenberg who takes the Pātimokkha alone to be the older portion poses the following question. 'The question is, therefore, whether the ordinances originally appeared with the explanatory notes as in the Vibhaṅga, the Pātimokkha being subsequently extracted from it, or whether the Pātimokkha alone was the older portion, the additional matter of the

¹ *Vinaya Texts* I, SBE.XIII, pp.ix-x.

Vibhaṅga being the work of subsequent revision.¹ He refers to Rhys Davids as holding a different view: `Mr. Rhys Davids considers the Pātimokkha of more recent origin than the works which form the great *complexus* of the Tipiṭaka, and assumes that at the time when the latter works were collected, the Pātimokkha either did not exist or was of too recent a date to be admitted into the holy writings.² It would be seen in the course of the present study that we are in perfect agreement with Mr. Rhys Davids on this point.

But we are surprised to find Rhys Davids and Oldenberg push their argument too far and say the following regarding the place of the Pātimokkha in the Canon.

`... and indeed the work, as a separate work, is not considered among Buddhists to belong to the Piṭakas at all, and is therefore not included in the list of works of which the Piṭakas consist.³ Winternitz too seems to hold the same idea.⁴

While we subscribe to the view that the Pātimokkha as an independent Vinaya treatise has been subsequently extracted

¹ Vin.I.p.xvi.

² Ibid.

³ *Vinaya Texts* I, SBE.XIII, p.xiv.

⁴ Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature* II, p.24.

from the Suttavibhaṅga, very probably before it reached its present form, we should point out here the inaccuracy of the statement that Buddhists do not consider the Pātimokkha as belonging to the Piṭakas. Buddhaghosa himself, perhaps backed by a contemporary tradition, includes the two Pātimokkhas under the contents of the Vinaya Piṭaka (*Tattha paṭhamasaṅgītiyaṃ saṅgītañ ca asaṅgītañ ca sabbam'pi samodhānetvā ubhayāni pātimokkhāni dve vibhaṅgāni dvāvīsati khandhakā soḷasaparivārā'ti idaṃ vinayapiṭakaṃ nāma* - DA.I.17 & VinA.I.18).

On the other hand we should also here take note of the Cullavagga account of the First Council (Vin.II.287). No attempt is made there to name any specific texts under the Vinaya recital, its entire contents being brought under the designation of *ubhato vinaya* [PTS and Cambodian text reading. See p.79 n.3]. We presume *ubhato* implies `of both Bhikkhu and Bhikkhunī. *Vinaya* here has to be taken to include both the Vibhaṅga (Mahā-vibhaṅga and Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga) as well as the Khandhakas, possibly in their initial, rudimentary form. We reject the Sri Lanka Buddha Jayanti Tripiṭaka Series - Volume 5(2), of 1983, p. 550 reading *vibhaṅge* for *vinaye* which would totally exclude the Khandhaka Vinaya. [We are aware of the existence in Sri Lanka of a 1910 edition of the Cullavagga by Bentara Saddhatissa Thera which reads *ubhato vinaye*, in total

agreement with PTS and Cambodian texts.] In the samples given here of the work recited under Vinaya we discover portions of the detailed work, the Suttavibhaṅga and not of the bare code, the Pātimokkha.

This core of the Suttavibhaṅga, on account of its association with the fortnightly recital called the Uddesa which had a specific religious disciplinary function, came to be known by the name of Pātimokkha. From the point of view of the recital it was also called the Uddesa. As the bare code, without any details, it was also designated as *sutta*. The Cullavagga distinguishes the two as follows:.. *tassa n'eva suttam āgataṃ hoti no suttavibhaṅgo*.¹ The Commentary on this statement brings out their relative values in the following remarks: *N'eva suttam āgatan'ti na mātikā āgatā. No suttavibhaṅgo'ti vinayo na paṇḍo*.² The knowledge of the suttas, without their details is

¹ Vin.II.96. It is important to maintain the distinction between these suttas (*sutta*) and the texts of the Sutta Piṭaka which are referred to as Suttas or Suttantas, and are viewed as belonging to a sphere outside the Vinaya and Abhidhamma Piṭakas. *Note: Anāpatti na vivaṇṇetukāmo iṅgha tvaṃ suttante vā gāthāyo vā abhidhammaṃ vā pariyāpuṇassu pacchā vinayaṃ pariyāpuṇissasīti bhaṇati -* Vin.IV.144.

² VinA.VI.1197.

only fragmentary learning. It is not Vinaya. The inadequacy of these bare regulations for the successful maintenance of monastic discipline is clear from this reference in the Vinaya Piṭaka.¹ (*Tehi ce bhikkhave bhikkhūhi tasmim̐ adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne tatra'ssa bhikkhu dhammakathiko tassa suttaṃ hi kho āgataṃ hoti no suttavibhṅgo. So atthaṃ asallakkhento vyaññanacchāyāya atthaṃ patibāhati* - Vin.II.97.)

Speaking of the Uddesa, Rhys Davids says: `The completion of the recitation is therefore evidence that all who have taken part in it are pure in respect of the specified offences. And this is the origin of that second name, the Pātimokkha, which means the Acquittal, or Deliverance or Discharge.'²

Careful examination of available evidence has led us to conclusions not very different from the above. We have attempted a detailed study of the many problems connected with the Pātimokkha in a chapter specially devoted to it.³

Speaking of the origin of what now constitutes the Pātimokkha, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg express the following view.

¹ Vin.II.97.

² Rhys Davids, *Buddhism* (American Lectures), p.54.

³ Ch.IX. See also Ch.VIII.

`Tradition even ascribes the first laying down of each clause to the Buddha himself. This tradition is of course very far from being conclusive. But neither should we hold it impossible that the Pātimokkha, either in its present shape, or at least in its most essential parts, can reach back to the Buddha's own time, or to that of his personal disciples.'¹

Of these remarks, we shall say for the present that they are characterised by their sobriety and moderation. Evidence in support of the ideas expressed here, we shall furnish in due course.

Regarding the origin of the Pātimokkha as a ritual among the Buddhist Saṅgha, Dutt seems to base his investigations on two assumptions. First, he assumes that the disciples of the Buddha, at first, formed a loosely-strung group without any disciplinary rules of their own. Hence he concludes that they needed a bond of union and that Pātimokkha was therefore originally used in that sense and for that purpose. Secondly, in spite of his perfect disregard for legend, Dutt is willing to treat the Mahāpadāna Sutta as a reliable bit of historical evidence.²

¹ *Vinaya Texts*. I.SBE.XIII.p.xi.

² S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, pp.81-84.

We have shown elsewhere that we take a very different attitude with regard to both these assumptions. It will be made clear that all available evidence prove more the contrary and we are compelled to reject the following statement of Dutt as lacking in historical support.

" But the Pātimokkha, the `bond' or the external token of union of the Bhikkhu-saṅgha, changed its character, shortly after the founder's decease, from a mere declaration of faith in the Dhamma to a discipline and rule of life. "¹

Speaking further of the Pātimokkha, Dutt says: `The existence of the Pātimokkha at first as a mere code and not a ritual is beyond all legitimate doubt.' According to Dutt's idea stated earlier the Pātimokkha, upto the founder's decease, was apparently only `a mere declaration of faith in the Dhamma'. From when does he then date `the existence of the Pātimokkha at first as a mere code' ? Besides, where does one get this original form as `a mere code' ? Does one find such a code divorced from the confessional meeting of the Uposatha and referred to by the name of Pātimokkha? How does one ignore the references to the Uddesa, which mean the recital at the confessional meetings, which occur in the Suttas and in the

¹ Ibid.p.73.

Vinaya, including the Pātimokkha itself ?¹ If what Dutt means by 'the present ritual form of the Pātimokkha' is the presence of 'the *Introductory formular* at the beginning and the *Interrogatory Portions* appended to each section'² in the text of the Pātimokkha, then one is compelled to point out that these 'later additions' should be as old as the days when Uddesa or the recital of the list of *sikkhāpada*, the confession of guilt by transgressing monks and the consequent punishment of offenders were the functions of the Uposatha. Both those portions of the text referred to above are essential to give the recital of the Pātimokkha a truly live function. We have shown that this was in fact so in the early days of the Sāsana. At any rate, one cannot speak of an original form of the Pātimokkha earlier than this. What did exist was the body of *sikkhāpada*.

It is lamentable that Dutt tries to discover a form 'Pātimokkhā' in the plural and says that it 'cannot but mean the rules of law contained in the code'.³ But we have to point out that this assumed plural form is only the second member, mutilated from the compound *sampanna-pātimokkhā*. Hence we should understand the plural form here as belonging to the

¹ M.II.8; III.10; A.I.230; Vin.I.102; IV.143,144.

² S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.81.

³ *Ibid.*p.74.

compound as a whole and not to the word Pātimokkha. Compare the similar use of the form `sampanna-sīlā' in the same context.¹

It is also Dutt's idea that `the Suttavibhaṅga in fact, regards the Pātimokkha as a mere code, while the Mahāvagga regards it as a liturgy.'² Whatever he means here by a `mere code' and a `liturgy', let us repeat again what we have said earlier that the Suttavibhaṅga knows of the recital of the Pātimokkha at the confessional meetings of the Uposatha.³

As Dutt pursues his own line of argument he is led to the following observations regarding the exercise of disciplinary authority of the Pātimokkha:

`But there were graver offences for which confession would be no atonement. It is difficult to ascertain how these offences were dealt with before the Buddhist Order had attained to that stage when each Bhikkhu was regarded as member of a single corporate body, of a particular Saṅgha, subject to its disciplinary jurisdiction.'⁴

¹ M.I.33.

² S.Dutt, *op.cit.*p.75.

³ Vin.IV.43,144.

⁴ S.Dutt, *op.cit.*p.85.

It would be clear at this stage that the above remarks result from Dutt's confusion of the connotation of Saṅgha and Cātuddisa Saṅgha in the early history of the Sāsana, The Buddhist Order had attained to that stage that he speaks of at a very early date.

Let us now turn our attention to the rest of the Vinaya Piṭaka with which we are interested, viz. the Suttavibhaṅga and the Khandhakas. Let us introduce the Suttavibhaṅga with the following remarks of Miss Horner whose unsurpassed familiarity with the Vinaya literature lends such maturity to her judgement on problems of Buddhist monastic discipline:

‘The Vinaya, the Discipline, especially that portion of it called Suttavibhaṅga, appoints and decrees a definite standard of outward morality, comprised in courses of training laid down for the proper behaviour of monks and nuns. On the surface the Suttavibhaṅga is not much more than an attempt to restrain unsuitable behaviour; but in reality it also arrives, though in many cases by a long process of exclusion, at the kind of positive conduct to be pursued by the monk who wishes his life to be externally blameless, so far as his relations with his fellow

monks, with the Order as a whole, and with the laity are concerned.¹

Here are the views of Rhys Davids regarding the Suttavibhaṅga: `The book deals with each of the 227 rules in order and following throughout one set scheme or method. That is to say it tells us firstly how and when and why the particular rule in question came to be laid down. This historical introduction always closes with the words of the rule in full. Then follows a very ancient word-for-word commentary on the rule - a commentary so old that it was already about B.C.400 (the probable approximate date of the Suttavibhaṅga) considered so sacred that it was included in the canon. And the Old Commentary is succeeded, where necessary, by further explanations and discussions of doubtful points. These are sometimes of very great historical value. The discussions, for instance (in the rules as to murder and theft), of what constitutes murder, and what constitutes theft, anticipate in a very remarkable degree the kind of fine-drawn distinctions found in modern law books.²

¹ Miss Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, I.p.ix.

² Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, (American Lectures) p.55.

In relation to the Suttavibhaṅga Rhys Davids comments on the Khandhakas as follows:

‘It deals one after another with all those matters relating to Order which are not stated in so many words in the Rules of the Pātimokkha.’¹

Winternitz puts it more directly when he says that ‘the Khandhakas... form a kind of continuation and supplement of the Suttavibhaṅga.’² Speaking of the relation of Suttavibhaṅga to the Khandhakas in point of time, Rhys Davids says: ‘... it follows that in all probability they were composed, or put into their present shape, at about the same period in the development of early Buddhism - it is even possible that both works arose in immediate connection.’³ E.J. Thomas expresses the same idea in the following: ‘Besides these rules intended for the daily life of the individual monk, others were found necessary for the organization of the Order. These also in their essentials must have existed from the beginning. They are contained in the second part of the Vinaya known as the

¹ Ibid.p.56.

² Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, II.p.24.

³ *Vinaya Texts* I.SBE.XIII.P.xx.

Khandhakas and in the Pali are divided into two series (Mahāvagga and Cullavagga).¹

We are in perfect agreement with the views expressed above. The nature and scope of the contents of the Pātimokkha being so limited the Khandhakas had, of necessity, to take up the rest of monastic discipline from the very outset. Further, the contents of the Suttavibhaṅga being necessarily based on the text of the Pātimokkha admitted of no additions beyond that. On the other hand, the Khandhakas had to envisage and accommodate evolutionary changes. Thus the period of development of the whole of the Khandhakas must inevitably spread over a much longer period of time than that of the Suttavibhaṅga.

Oldenberg himself makes similar observations on the above subject:

‘While the Vibhaṅga stands in the closest relation to the Pātimokkha, there was a new and wider circle of additions added to that same centre of the Vinaya-discipline - the Pātimokkha - most probably about the same time in which the Vibhaṅga originated, an endeavour was made to go beyond the more confined domain of that series of ecclesiastical offences

¹ E.J.Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.21.

as established of old, to give a coherent picture of the whole legal life of the Saṅgha.¹

It would be clear from what has been said so far that we are on the whole in agreement with the views expressed by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, both jointly and severally, with regard to monastic discipline and Vinaya literature. One notable exception to this occurs in the ideas we hold regarding the text of the Pātimokkha and its place in the Canon. We hope we have succeeded in stating our position clearly in the light of evidence we have examined. On the other hand, the greatest disagreement is with the views expressed by Sukumar Dutt. We were compelled to make a detailed and exhaustive analysis of very many of his statements. After careful consideration we have expressed our opinion about them. The present study is therefore undertaken in the belief that we could make our contribution to the elimination of such failings as the following which vitiate a fair and unbiased examination and evaluation of the subject:

¹ Vin.I. p. xxii.

- i. Inadequate examination of all original source material.
- ii. Misinterpretations resulting from ignorance of the language, i.e. Pali, and lack of familiarity with the subject.
- iii. Misinterpretations resulting from a desire to force available evidence to fit into a preconceived pattern.

It is also our considered opinion that once these defects, which we have specifically pointed out in several works on the subject, are remedied it is also necessary to view the problems of monastic discipline from the wider angle of religion as a whole. For Buddhist monks are not a class of officiating priests. They are not members of a purely administrative hierarchy who tend the flock. They are symbolic of the religious earnestness of those who choose to follow the teaching of the Buddha. Their life has to be fashioned to accord with the professed faith. It must be such as would necessarily lead them to the aspired goal. Thus we feel the necessity to study Buddhist monastic discipline based on the joint evidence of the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas. Historically, there is no doubt that the Buddha had a message for the world, even before 'the group of five' (*pañcavaggiyā bhikkhū*) thought of joining him. One might call the contents of that message a philosophy or a way of life. One might therefore say with commendable accuracy that both the

theory and practice of good living were contained in these early teachings which are in the domain of the Dhamma (or Sutta according to subsequent classification). Thus the seeds of monastic discipline are seen to be rooted in the teaching of the Dhamma. With the spread and expansion of monastic life from the personal and the individual to an institutional group level we discover the problems of monastic discipline increasing in complexity. The efficacy of the 'early philosophy of life' seems to lose its grip on the increasing membership and this marks the appearance of the new medium of monastic control and administration. This is the birth of the Vinaya literature.¹

¹ But it is our belief that these observations on the Dhamma and the Vinaya do not justify the following remarks of B.C. Law with regard to the relation of the Vinaya to the Sutta Piṭaka:

‘The consideration of all these facts cannot but lead one to surmise that the treatises of the Vinayapiṭaka point to a sutta background in the Vinaya materials traceable in the nikāyas particularly in the Aṅguttara. The sutta background of the Vinaya texts is clearly hinted at in the concluding words of the Patimokkha. *Ettakaṃ tassa bhagavato suttāgataṃ suttapariyāpannaṃ anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchati.* *

This is far from being true. The word *sutta* in this context has been unfortunately misunderstood. What it means is that the contents of the Pātimokkha recital exists as a collection of *sutta* or rules (note the

It is from this basic position that we propose to proceed on our investigations. Therefore our primary source of information consists of the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas. These Canonical texts are read and studied with as much care as we could command with our present knowledge of the Pali language. Even where the meaning of texts is clear it has been our desire to probe further into the notes in the Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā) and the Sub-commentaries (Ṭīkā) for purposes of comparison and contrast. This has proved to be of immense

name Suttavibhaṅga) which the Buddha has laid down. As for the relation of the Aṅguttara to the Vinaya, it is the Aṅguttara which draws freely and extensively from the Vinaya. In places, the Aṅguttara looks like an anthology of Vinaya material. Law's own reference to A.I.98-100 should prove a sufficient indication of this tendency. The Vinaya contents of the Aṅguttara show more signs of development and editing than in the Vinaya Piṭaka. The reasons for laying down *sikkhāpada* for the disciples as given at A.I. 98 total up to 12 while the standard lists in the Vinaya Piṭaka have only 10. (See Vin.III.21) The two additional items are: 1. Consideration for laymen - *gihīnaṃ anukampāya* and 2. To break up the power of miscreant groups - *pāpicchānam pakkhūpacchedāya*. These evidently are additions to the original list of the Vinaya Piṭaka.

* See B.C. Law, *History of Pali Literature*, I.p.19.

value as would be shown in relevant places. Owing to the vastness of the field of study we have had to confine ourselves mainly to Pali literature. But in a number of places where we thought it extremely important we have ventured out into two further fields, namely Sanskrit and Chinese. In both cases our suspicions and speculation which prompted us to go to them have been amply rewarded. Considering the complexity of the problems of monasticism within Buddhism itself we have thought it wise to leave any references to Jainism completely out of the present study.

As a basic source of investigation our choice invariably falls on the Theravāda school which upheld the monastic ideals of the faithful disciple in Buddhism: *saddhā agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajito*. Monastic discipline is essentially their concern. At the same time it is clear from the evidence relating to the early history of the Buddhist Saṅgha that the first hundred years of the Sāsana knew of only a single body of disciples, more or less homogenous. One does not discover at this stage any traces of groups with distinct names which indicate their partisan loyalties or sectarian teachings. Thus one is inclined to consider terms like Theriya (Theravāda) and Mahāsaṅghika as being obviously necessitated by the first schism in the Sāsana, the distinction between them being essentially relative.

However, disagreements and differences of opinion did exist within this apparently homogenous body of early sisciples. While a common Dhamma and Vinaya guided their destinies during this period, it becomes clear in our studies that the Dhamma begins to lend itself to diverse interpretations and the Vinaya comes to be challenged and criticised as being too stringent. Although it is not always possible to identify the men behind these moves, the portents are visible threatening a schism in the Sāsana, be it either on account of the Dhamma or the Vinaya.

Thus we are not surprised to find, on a comparison of the Prātimokṣa sūtras of the different schools, that the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas share the greatest measure of agreement, having coexisted so long close to each other during their formative years. It is with this common heritage that they part their ways and as they develop their own distinctive doctrines and traditions, the new schools which emerge align themselves with the one or the other.

However, it should be pointed out here that in the seven categories of ecclesiastical offences listed in the Prātimokṣa sūtra there is almost complete conformity among all the early schools with regard to the first six categories. These account for 145 out of the total of 220 rules. In the last category of minor

rules dealing with etiquette, propriety and decorum called the Sekhiya Dhamma, however the new schools show an evident increase. While the Theravāda school lists 75 and the Mahāsaṅghika 66 under this category, the Sarvāstivādins go as far as 113.¹

The reason for this agreement in their Vinaya literature between the Theravāda and the Mahāsaṅghika on the one hand and between these and the later schools on the other is more to be sought in the fact that these legal enactments of the Vinaya being stratified in a fixed form at a very early date and being shared unaltered by the earliest groups which appeared after the first schism, namely the Theriya and the Mahāsaṅghika, left little room for any changes or modifications. But the weight of ideological changes and changes of tradition in the different schools is certainly felt in the less stratified historical records and in the instructions on procedure in the rest of the Vinaya literature, particularly the portions which correspond to the Khandhakas of the Theravāda Vinaya and portions of the Suttavibhaṅga.

These observations do not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the Theravāda literature preserves completely

¹ W. Pachow, Comparative study of the Prātimokṣa, p.11.

the Buddha's teaching on monastic discipline, i.e. the Vinaya, in its original form. However, comparing it as a whole with that of the Mahāsaṅghikas one cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that the canonical texts of the Theravāda Vinaya show more coherence and continuity as well as a conciseness in the statement of ideas which entitle them to be considered closer to the time of the origin of the Buddhist monastic institutions.

We do indicate, at the same time, more than one instance in the Theravāda Vinaya literature where we suspect a violation of the spirit of the early traditions and injunctions. On the other hand, we do find the Mahāsaṅghikas to be more alert at times and more sensitive to such discrepancies. In such instances the traditions preserved or the modifications effected by the 'dissentients' appear to us to be more orthodox than the Theravāda version.

Nevertheless, assessing the overall position we are led to use the Vinaya literature of the Theravādins together with their suttas dealing with the Dhamma, as the basis of this study. Evidence from other schools of Buddhism has been brought in from time to time both to investigate a doubtful proposition and to stabilise a tottering tradition.

Before we bring these prefatory remarks to a close we should make a few observations on Buddhist monastic

discipline in general. As the teacher (*satthā*) who had a new message (*dhamma*) for the world, the Buddha was soon surrounded by a group of disciples who chose to follow him (*uddissa pabbajitā*). This placed him, as the Pali texts describe it, in the distinguished position of being the propounder of a completely new way (*anakkhātassa maggassa akkhātā*- M.III. 8). The disciples were the followers of that way (*maggānugā ca pana etarahi sāvakā viharanti pacchā samannāgatā* - ibid.). At this stage in life, the Buddha was making no experiments. As early as the First Sermon, he had known as to what should constitute the foundations of Buddhist monastic life. He himself had been through a life of mendicancy which led him to his enlightenment. He denounced both the life of sensual pleasures and that of extreme austerity as being unsuited for a Buddhist disciple (*Dve'me bhikkhave antā pabbajitena na sevittabbā*...Vin.I.10.) The life he enjoined on them steered clear of these two extremes.

Early Buddhist monastic life, which was thus one definite way for one definite purpose, admitted of no compromises. It would be shown in the relevant places that the Buddha was firmly opposed to those who rebelled against discipline and dealt with them with such strictness as worthy of a teacher who does not swerve from his ideals for the sake of popularity with his pupils. Additions and modifications to rules which did not

violate their spirit were accepted and even initiated by the Buddha himself. Constructive evolution of this nature did, in fact, bring the Vinaya Piṭaka into its present shape. Against destructive revolutionary trends, legislation was enacted and the very machinery of the Vinaya was geared against them.¹

Thus Buddhist monastic life being what we have shown it to be, the content of its discipline had to embrace every aspect of life as viewed in Buddhism. According to Buddhism, life activity goes on through the three media of thought, word and deed. Progress or depravity are reckoned in terms of refinement or deterioration of these. Therefore the total content of Buddhist monastic discipline had to be in terms of thought, word and deed. Even in what appears to be a modified statement of old material Buddhaghosa clearly upholds this view.²

Of this threefold discipline, it is said that the Vinaya Piṭaka claims to concern itself only with two, viz. word and deed. They are the aspects of outward conduct (*Tasmā vividhanayattā vīsesanayattā kāyavācānañ ca vinayanato vinayo'ti akkhāto*).³ Here we would also refer the reader to Oldenberg's very precise

¹ See Vin.IV.126,143,152,153.

² SA.III.230.

³ VinA.I.19; DA.I.17; DhsA.19

definition which describes the Vinaya Piṭaka `as a collection of rules regulating the outward conduct of the Saṅgha and the Bhikkhu'.¹ But true monastic discipline covers a little more. It embraces the discipline of the mind too. It has been our endeavour to relate this to the former and to show that any violation of the former would possibly produce serious repercussions on the latter.

Monasticism in Buddhism comes in the wake of the *brahmacariya* ideal which the Buddha preached from the beginning of his mission. Hence our present study primarily springs from the study of the life of *brahmacariya* in Buddhism. But even prior to the birth of the Buddha the notion of *brahmacariya* has had an appeal to the religious men of India. Each creed had its own form of Brahmacharya life leading to its desired goal, which was often termed emancipation, immortality or divine absorption. In Chapter II we deal with the different forms of *brahmacariya* both in the Brahmanic and non-Brahmanic religious creeds. Chapter III portrays the Buddhist concept of *brahmacariya* in marked contrast to the rest. Chapters IV, V, VI and VII deal in succession with the foundations on which the life of *pabbajjā* is built. In Chapter VIII we have attempted to show how the early basis of monastic life

¹ Vin.I.p.xiii.

gradually changed its character from a simple system of advice and admonition to a complete code of monastic law. In Chapter IX one witnesses the disciplinary machinery of the Saṅgha at work. Numerous factors are seen retarding its efficiency in course of time.

Once the machinery of the Vinaya Piṭaka was set up it also became necessary to see that its operation was smooth and effective. Every attempt to put it out of gear was also guarded against. Thus, in the wake of the rules there also came provision for prosecution and punishment of those who violated them. We have made special studies of these aspects of the Vinaya in Chapters X and XI.

Besides all legislation and legal machinery, yet another factor played a very dominant part in the history of the Sāsana. It is the spiritual leadership which the members of the Order, individually and collectively, offered to the others and the integrated life in the community which contributed to its stability and well-being. See Chapter XII.

Whatever may be the verdict of the later generations on the role of Bhikkhunis in the Sāsana, there is no doubt that they distinguished themselves and fulfilled the mission of their monastic life with as much success as the Bhikkhus. Thus we have thought it fit to devote a part of this study to the

establishment of this new division of Buddhist monasticism and the formation of the code of discipline for the Bhikkhunis. In Chapters XIII and XIV we have examined this development in relation to the Order of the Bhikkhus and lay society of the day.

We have also thought it necessary at this stage to probe further into two problems which we think are very much more controversial than they seem to be on the surface. It appears as though history has stratified them in such a way as to be unquestionably settled. But curiosity has spurred us into this venture of re-investigating them.

The two problems are:

Legislation regarding the exclusion of a guilty monk (*sāpattika*) from the recital of the Pātimokkha. See Appendix I.

The attitude of the Saṅgha of the Theriya Group towards the 'lesser and minor' precepts (*khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni*). See Appendix II.

We have attempted to compare and contrast the evidence found in Pali literature with those we have been able to gather from Sanskrit and Chinese sources. If we have succeeded in indicating even to some extent the complexity of these problems we would feel more than amply rewarded.

The Sīmā also has been a subject of great interest in the history of Buddhist monasticism, both during the life time of the Buddha and in the centuries that followed. We have occasion to refer to it briefly in the study of the Pātimokkha ritual. But we feel that the subject needs more careful analysis and examination. Hence we have pursued the matter further and we present our observations to the reader separately in an appendix. See Appendix III.

It is our belief that this brief outline of the contents of the present study will enable the reader to view the problems of Buddhist monasticism from a fresh angle as he reads through this thesis. It is also hoped that he would be able to purge his mind of various misconceptions about the subject which have been created through mistakes of omission and commission of some of the pioneer work.

CHAPTER II

Brahmacharya:

The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

Throughout the pages of Indian religious thought, in Buddhist as well as non-Buddhist terminology, *brahmacharya* (Pali *brahmachariya*) is the term of choice used to designate the life of discipline ordained for the aspirant to spiritual awakening. The life of *brahmacharya* had a meaning and purpose to many in India even before the appearance of Buddhism. Here we shall be concerned with a survey of the background of Buddhism in which the life of *brahmacharya* under diverse religious traditions was widely known. A passage in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad in which one seems to get a glimpse of the first beginnings of the Catur Āśrama doctrine of the Brahmins¹ refers to the life of *brahmacharya* as one of 'the three *dharmaskandhas*' each of which is regarded as capable of leading the adherent to a state of spiritual edification or a 'world of bliss' (*puṇyaloka*). According to the text the result of the pursuit of these *dharmaskandha* is that thereby one becomes an heir to a

¹ Belvalkar and Ranade, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol.2.p.216.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

punyaloka (Trayo dharmaskandhā yajño'dhyayanaṃ dānam iti prathamas. Tapa eva dvitīyas. Brahmacharyā cāryakulavāsī tṛtīyo' tyantamātmānam ācāryakule' vasādayan. Sarva ete puṇyalokā bhavanti brahmasamstho'mṛtatvameti - Chānd.2.23.1.).

Śaṅkara, commenting on this passage in the Chāndogya, identifies these *dharmaskandha* with the stages of the Āśrama doctrine and goes on to say that each Āśramin reaches a *puṇyaloka* by virtue of his own dharma (*Sarva ete trayo'pyāśramino yathoktair dharmaih puṇyalokā bhavanti - ibid.*). But we are not certain how far one could look for the pattern of the fully developed Catur Āśrama□ Dharma in this passage. Belvalkar and Ranade, in their chronological grouping of the Upaniṣadic texts, place this section of the Chāndogya in the early portion of group one which they call Brahmanic.¹ Hence we would consider this as one of the earliest references to the institution of *brahmacharya*, perhaps as a unit in itself or as a part of religious life in the Brahmanic tradition. It is not convincingly clear whether these three *dharmaskandha* are parts of an integrated whole. Each one of them seems to have a justification in itself and appears capable of producing the

¹ Ibid.p.135.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

desired effect of a *punya-loka*, although such a state may not be identified with the highest goal which is *amṛtatva*. For, over and above these *dharmaskandha*, the highest premium is set on what is referred to as *brahmasaṁstha*, because it is the *brahmasaṁstha* who attains *amṛtatva* or immortality (*Brahmasaṁstho amṛtatvameti* - *ibid.*)

Therefore we would consider *brahmacharya* here as still being ranked as one of several ways of religious living. It is worth noting the ritualistic bias of some of the other *dharmaskandhas* which are mentioned along with *brahmacharya*. They do not reflect a moral or ethical basis of religious life or an intellectual attitude towards it. The inclusion of *adhyayana* and *brahmacharya* along with *yajña* and *tapas* approximates to a fusion of old and new ideas about religious life. *Brahmacharya* here is still neither the religious initiation nor the stepping stone to social uplift among the Brahmins as it was at a later date.¹ Those who took to this life of *brahmacharya*, it may be argued,

¹ See Śaṅkara's comment on Chānd.6.1.1 *He tvetaketo'nurūpaṃ gurum kulasya no gatvā vasa brahmacharyaṃ. Na caitadyuktaṃ yadasmakulīno he somyananūcyānadhītya brahmabandhuriva bhavati brāhmaṇān bandhūn vyapadisati na svayaṃ brāhmaṇavṛtta iti.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

did so out of their own choice with a view to spiritual edification. It was undoubtedly a life of devotion and dedication as is clear from the passage in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad which describes the *brahmacārin* as wearing himself away at the house of his teacher (*Brahmacāryācāryakulavāsī tṛtīyo'tyantamātmānamācāryakule'* - ibid.). This old Brahmanic institution of *brahmacharya* which evidently was the choice of a select few underwent a process of popularisation in the formulation of the Catur Āśrama Dharma whereby it was brought into the life of every Brahmin, or in fact of every member of the three principal castes. The religious and secular duties of life were magnificently blended together in this fourfold institution. However, it is clear that the older concept of *brahmacharya* constituted a way of religious life which was, more or less, complete in itself.

The Manusmṛti describes two different types of *brahmacārins* who are referred to in the Commentary of Medhātithi as *naiṣṭhika* and *upakurvāṇa*.¹ The former is lifelong studentship. It is described as an effective means of

¹ *Dvividho brahmacārī pūrvatra pratipādītaḥ naiṣṭhika upakurvāṇaś cetī.* Medhātithibhāṣya on Manu.3.1.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

making an end of *samsāra*.¹ This *naiṣṭhika* evidently refers to the older concept of *brahmacharya* which was a lifelong institution and which had to be lived under a teacher. This completely religious life which was divorced from social obligations did promise as its goal the attainment of Brahman.² Thus as a way of life it could not be displaced completely with the inauguration of the Catur Āśrama Dharma. Brahmanic tradition often shows acquaintance with both. The latter, *upakurvāṇa*, which shows more conformity to the Catur Āśrama Dharma, was a limited period of studentship whereby initiation into true Brahminhood was effected through the mastery of the sacred learning. Manu gives thirty-six years as the maximum

¹ *Ā samāpteh śarīrasya yastu śuśrūsate gurum sa gacchatyañjasā vipro brahmaṇah sadma śāsvatam* - Manu.2.244. The point of special interest here is Medhātithi's comment on *brahmaṇah sadma śāsvatam* which reads as *na punah samsāram pratipadyata iti yāvat* - Ibid.

² Ibid. The commentary of Medhātithi countenances the possibility of explaining Brahman here either as a personal god or as the Paramātman. *Brahmaśabdena c'eti hāsadarśane devaviśeśaś caturvaktrah tasya sadma sthānaviśeśah divi vidyate. Vedāntavādinām tu brahma paramātmā tasya sadma svarūpam eva tadbhāvāpattih.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

period of time for this preparation which he calls the '*traivedikaṃ vratam*' or dedication to the study of the three Vedas.¹ He apparently shows no concern for the fourth Veda, the Atharvan, as a part of the sacred learning. Thus each Veda would have a maximum period of twelve years for its study. But the possibility is indicated of completing the study of the Vedas in much less time. It is in fact brought down to a total of nine years thus giving only three years for each Veda. This is considered possible only in the case of exceptionally good students.²

This tradition of twelve years for the study of each Veda during the period of Brahmacharya appears to have been well known to the Buddhists. But the Buddhist texts which speak of the Brahmin institution of *brahmacharya* apparently go a step further than Manu in this connection. What they describe as *komārabrahmacariya* of the Brahmins extends over forty-eight years.³ This *komārabrahmacariya* unmistakably refers to the

¹ Sattriṃsadābdikaṃ caryaṃ gurau traivedikaṃ vratam tadardhikaṃ pādikaṃ vā grahaṇāntikameva vā - Manu.3.1.

² Kathaṃ punartribhirvarsairvedah śakyo grahītum. Bhavati kaścīn medhāvitamah. Medhātithi's comment on Manu.3.1.

³ Atthacattālīsaṃ vassāni komārabrahmacariyaṃ carimsu te

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

period of studentship during which the study of the sacred literature was undertaken. Here the Buddhist texts seem to be in accord with Baudhāyana who alone states that the term of studentship extends over forty-eight years. This rule includes the Atharva-veda.¹ However, we are not in a position here to examine the reasons for this preference shown by the Buddhists.

In the vast complex of Upaniṣadic thought it is difficult to see a singleness either with regard to what constituted the life of *brahmacharya* or the nature of the goal that was to be attained by means of it. However, there is no doubt that *brahmacharya* meant a period, limited or otherwise, of training in religious life under the guidance of a teacher. Some of the early Upaniṣads, deviating perhaps from the 'older' *nai-ṁthika brahmacharya* way which was a complete means by itself, use *brahmacharya* as a vital part of religious life on to which are grafted moral and ethical considerations.

vijjācaraṇapariyeṭṭhiṃ acarum brāhmaṇā pure - Sn.v.289. So atṭhacattāḷisam vassāni komārabrahmacariyaṃ carati mante adhīyamāno - A.III.224.

¹ The Laws of Manu, Tr. G. Buhler, SBE.XXV, p.74. See note on III.1.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad which has a claim to a relative antiquity¹ gives *brahmacharya* along with truth, austerity and correct knowledge (*satyam*, *tapas* and *samyagñāna*) as a means of reaching the Ātman.² The Praśna Upaniṣad which chronologically belongs to the succeeding group³ attaches similar importance to *brahmacharya* when it says the following:

They indeed possess that Brahma-world,
Who possess austerity (*tapas*) and chastity
(*brahmacharya*)
In Whom truth is established.
To them belongs yon stainless Brahma-world,
In whom there is no crookedness and falsehood, nor
trickery (*māyā*).⁴

¹ Belvalkar and Ranade, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol.2.p.125.

² *Satyena labhyas tapasā hyesa ātmā samyagñānena brahmacharyena nityam* - Muṇḍ.3.1.5.

³ Belvalkar and Ranade, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol.2.p.135.

⁴ Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*, p.380. *Tesāmevaisa brahmaloko yesām tapo brahmacharyam yesu satyam pratiṣṭhitam. Tesāmasau virajo brahmaloko na yeṣu jihmamanṛtam na māyā ceti* - Praśna.1.15.16.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

This is a further indication of the insistence on moral values. One cannot fail to notice at this stage the fact that the goal of religious life presented in the Upaniṣads is, in itself, not a fixed concept. Brahma, whatever it may connote in different contexts, comes to be repeatedly given as the goal which is to be reached through *brahmacharya*. At any rate, the motive underlying this Brahma-reaching was the escape from this whirl of human existence. 'He leads them on to Brahma. This is the way to the gods, the way to Brahma. They who proceed by it return not to the human condition here - yea, they return not.'¹ The importance of the observance of *brahmacharya* in the sphere of religious life has been very keenly recognised in the Upaniṣads. Chāndogya 8.4.3 says that only those who find the Brahma-world through *brahmacharya* possess the Brahma-world.² The next khaṇḍa of the same text goes so far as to identify *brahmacharya* with a host of sacrificial duties of varying degrees of importance thus giving *brahmacharya* the pride of

¹ Hume. *op.cit.*p.224.

Sa enān brahma gamayateṣa devapatho brahmapatha etena pratipadyamānā imaṃ mānavamāvartaṃ nāvartante nāvartante -
Chānd.4.15.5.

² *Tadya evaitaṃ brahmalokaṃ brahmacharyeṇānuvindanti tesāmevaiṣa brahmalokah -* Ibid.8.4.3.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

place as the sole means to the attainment of the highest goal.¹ *Brahmacharya* is equated to what people call 'sacrifice' (*yajña*), what people call 'what has been sacrificed' (*iṣṭam*), what people call 'the protracted sacrifice' (*sattrāyaṇa*), what people call 'silent asceticism' (*mauna*), what people call 'a course of fasting' (*anāsakāyana*) and what people call 'betaking oneself to hermit life in the forest' (*araṇyāyana*).² But it should be pointed out that these portions of the Chāndogya belong to the late period of the Upaniṣadic group.³ We are not in a position to determine with any certainty whether *brahmacharya* here is completely identified with the first stage of the Catur Āśrama Dharma. Apparently, it is as a part of this systematised way of life that *brahmacharya* here eclipses, more or less, the cult of *yajña* and *tapas*.

This complexity of the idea of *brahmacharya* which we find in the Upaniṣads is simplified by the commentators who readily identify this *brahmacharya* with the first stage of the Catur Āśrama Dharma. At Chānd.2.23.1 Śaṅkara identifies the three *dharmaśāstra* which include *brahmacharya* with three of the

¹ *Atha yadyajña ityācakṣate brahmacharyameva tad...* Ibid.8.5.1.-3.

² Hume, *op.cit.* p.266.

³ Belvalkar and Ranade, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol.2.p.135.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

four *āśramas*. The commentators associate the following ideas with this institution of *brahmacharya*:

- (a) That one lives the life of *brahmacharya* under a teacher for the purpose of religious education.¹ The importance of *brahmacharya* for the acquisition of sacred knowledge is reaffirmed by Śāṅkara in his comment on Brh. 5.2.1 where he points out that *brahmacharya* is the basis of studentship.²
- (b) That the practice of celibacy and renunciation of all desire for women constitute the hallmark of this institution of *brahmacharya*. Commenting on Chāṅd 8. 4. 3. Śāṅkara says that *brahmacharya* is the renunciation of desire for women.³ At Muṅḍ. 3. 1. 5 he defines *brahmacharya* as the negation of the enjoyment of the company of women.⁴ In the wake of this negative virtue comes the acquisition of instruction from one's teacher to which we have already referred above. Rāmānuja puts this effectively as 'instruction and guidance from the teacher is preceded by the life of *brahmacharya*, which in turn is characterised by the renunciation of desire for women.'⁵

¹ *Brahmacharyam svādhyāya grahaṇāya he bhavati vivatsyācāryakule.*
Śāṅkara on Chāṅd.4.4.1.

² *Śiṣyatvavṛtter brahmacharyasya prādhānyācchisyāh santo brahmacharyamūsuruṣitavanta ityarthah.* Śāṅkara on Brh.5.2.1.

³ *Tattatraivaṃ satyetaṃ brahmalokaṃ brahmacharyeṇa strīviṣayatṛṣṇātyāgena āpādayanti.*

⁴ *Sarvatra samyagjñānena yathābhūtātmadarśanena brahmacharyeṇa maithunāsamacāreṇa*

⁵

Strīviṣayatṛṣṇātyāgarūpabrahmacharyapūrvakaśāstrācāryopadeśādina

....

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

- (c) That *brahmacharya* is the initiation into true Brahminhood through which every Brahmin must pass. It is clearly brought out in Śaṅkara's comment on Chānd. 6.1.1.¹

The pattern of *brahmacharya* in the Upaniṣads which we have discussed so far does not seem to be identifiable with that formulated in Buddhism. In the Upaniṣads the life of *brahmacharya* has a different end in view. It is the attainment of Brahma or the Brahma-world and the way to it is distinctly prescribed. In summing up the Upaniṣadic position the commentators recommend *brahmacharya* as a particular stage in life which is to be gone through for the purpose of religious and social accomplishment. However, the life of *brahmacharya* in the Upaniṣads and that in Buddhism seem to be drawn very close to each other in the remarks of Śaṅkara on Chānd. 8.7.3. Describing the practice of *brahmacharya* by Indra and Vairocana under Prajāpati, Śaṅkara goes on to say that although these two were jealous of each other before they came to Prajāpati, they gave up their failings such as greed, hatred, delusion and jealousy before commencing the life of

¹ *He svetaketo'nurūpaṃ gurum kulasya no gatvā vasa brahmacharyaṃ. Na caityadyuktaṃ yadasmātkulīno he somyānanūcyānadhītya brahmabandhuriva bhavatīti brāhmaṇān bandhūn vyapadiśati na svayaṃ brāhmaṇavṛtta iti.*

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

brahmācārya under Prajāpati.¹ It should be noted that these commentarial observations are peculiar to Śāṅkara alone. He seems thereby to make this ethical purge a pre-requisite of *brahmācārya*. Although this same ethical purge, viz. the elimination of *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* is the fundamental concern of Buddhism, the Buddhist life of *brahmācārya* does not begin with it. On the other hand, the life of *brahmācārya* is undertaken in Buddhism, as will be shown below, for the purpose of eliminating *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* by a gradual process of development. Their elimination is given as the goal of *brahmācārya*.² The disciples of the Buddha are thus guided through *brahmācārya* towards this end.³

The Atharva-veda which lies outside the Brahmanic tradition of the three Vedas presents to us at 11. 5 a very different

¹ *Vidyāprāptiprayojanagauravāt tyaktarāgadveṣamohersyādidoṣaveva bhūtvōṣatur brahmācāryaṃ prajāpatau. śāṅkara on Chānd. 8.7.3.*

² *Yo kho bhikkhave rāgakkhāyo dosakkhāyo mohakkhāyo idaṃ brahmācāriyapariyosānaṃ ti - S.V.8,16,26.*

³ *yassa kassaci bhikkhave bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā cakkhu - viññeyyesu rūpesu uppajjeyya chando vā rāgo vā doso vā paṭighaṃ vā'pi cetaso tato cittaṃ nivāraye Na tvaṃ arahasī'ti tato cittaṃ nivāraye cakkhuvīññeyyehi rūpehi ... pe - S.IV.195.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

character in the person of the *brahmachārin*. Bloomfield makes the following observations on this hymn: `Here a Brahma disciple - *brahmachārin* - in the full glory of his holy functions and monastic habits is treated as an incarnation of the *brahma*; from him the *brahma* springs, and in his holy life - *brāhmaṇam* - the *brahma* is glorified.¹ Griffith too refers to this hymn as a glorification of the *brahmachārin* or religious student.² According to this Atharvan hymn the *brahmachārin* is infinitely powerful and controls the universe and the gods therein. `He hath established firmly earth and heaven.³ He has command over both worlds. `Stirring both worlds the Brahmachāri moveth.⁴ He takes precedence over Brahma too, and all this power he derives through *tapas*. `The Brahmachāri, earlier born than Brahma, sprang up through Fervour, robed in hot libation.⁵ His power of *tapas* is repeatedly mentioned. He is the most potent factor in the universe. He is the source from which the highest Brahma sprang and all the gods owe their origin to him. `From

¹ Bloomfield, *The Atharva-veda*, p.89.

² Griffith, *The Hymns of the Atharva-veda*, vol.II.p.68. n.

³ *Ibid.*XI.V.1.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*XI.V.5.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

him sprang the heavenly lore, the highest Brahma, and all the Gods, with life that lasts for ever.¹ All life, both animate and inanimate, sprang from him. `The plants, what is and what shall be, day, night, the tall tree of the wood, the year with seasons of the year, all from the Brahmachāri sprang. All creatures of the earth and heaven, tame animals and sylvan beasts, winged and wingless creatures, from the Brahmachāri sprang to life.² In him lay the ultimate guardianship of all. `The Brahma that is stored within the Brahmachāri guards them all.³ The contents of this hymn seems to give an indication that the *brahmachārin* of the Atharva-veda belongs to a different tradition. Religiously he may be regarded as being more primitive in character, deriving his power mainly through *tapas* and *yajñā*. Nevertheless, it shows the wide acceptance and unchallenged importance which the institution of *brahmacharya* had acquired.

We are also aware that the term *brahmacharya* was something familiar to the other contemporary religious circles as well. The term was used by them to mean the ideal life

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.XI.V.20,21.

³ Ibid.XI.V.22.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

prescribed by each. The Bodhisatta¹ himself refers to the religious life he opted to live under Ālāra Kālāma and Uddaka Rāmaputta as *brahmachariya*.² The Mahāvagga of the Vinaya Piṭaka refers to the religious life of the Jaṭilas who were contemporaries of the Buddha as *brahmachariya*. It is said that after the Buddha converted the Jaṭila chief, Uruvela Kassapa, people were still in doubt as to who really was converted, the Buddha or Uruvela Kassapa. So they questioned, 'Has Samaṇa Gotama taken up the life of *brahmachariya* under Kassapa or vice versa?'³ It is also said that Sāriputta and Moggallāna, prior

¹ The term Bodhisatta is used throughout this thesis to refer only to Buddha Gotama during the thirtyfive years of his early life, prior to his enlightenment. This covers both the princely life of twentynine years under the name of Siddhatta and the six years of mendicancy during which he came to be called Samaṇo Gotamo. Referring to this earlier period prior to his enlightenment, the Buddha calls himself the Bodhisatta: *Pubbe'va me bhikkhave sambodhā anabhisambuddhassa bodhisattassa sato* - M.I.24; S.II.10.

² *Īcchām'ahaṃ āvuso kālāma imasmiṃ dhammavinaye brahmachariyaṃ caritun'ti* - M.I.163.

³ *Atha kho tesaṃ dvādasanahutānaṃ māgadhikānaṃ brāhmaṇagahapatikānaṃ etadahosi. Kinnukho mahāsamaṇo uruvelakassape brahmachariyaṃ carati udāhu uruvelakassapo*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

to their conversion to Buddhism, lived the life of *brahmachariya* of the Paribbājakas under the Paribbājaka chief Sañjaya.¹ In the Assalāyana Sutta it is associated with the Seven Brahmin Sages of yore.² The Sandaka Sutta mentions eight such courses, which when judged by the criteria of the Buddhists, fall below standard. Hence they are termed *abrahmachariyavāsa* (no real abodes of *brahmachariya*) or *anassāsika-brahmachariya* (rewardless life of *brahmachariya*). They seem to include the Materialists (under the doctrine associated with Ajita Kesakambalī) and the Ājīvakas (under the doctrines of Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhali Gosāla and Pakudha Kaccāyana). None of these teachers, however, are referred to by name in the Sutta.³ In the Sutta, the venerable Ānanda explains to Sandaka Paribbājaka why the Buddha declared the religious life lived under most of the contemporary teachers as being void and worthless. In all cases it is pointed out that no wise man would choose to practise the *brahmachariya* under them and that if one

mahāsamane brahmachariyaṃ carati - Vin.I.36.

¹ *Tena kho pana samayena sārīputtamoggallānā sañjaye paribbājake brahmachariyaṃ caranti* - Vin.I.39.

² *Atha kho assalāyana sattannaṃ brāhmanisīnaṃ etaṃ ahoṣi moghaṃ vata no tapo aphalaṃ brahmachariyaṃ'ti* - M.II.155.

³ M.I.514f. Also see Basham, *The Ājīvikas*, p.17f.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

ever did he would thereby never gain enlightenment. Under the four *abrahmacariyavāsa* the doctrines of Ajita Kesakambalī, Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhalī Gosāla and Pakudha Kaccāyana are critically examined and the verdict is given that no true *brahmachariya* life could be lived under them. The four *anassāsikāni brahmachariyāni* refer to the following four types of teachers whose doctrines are similarly scrutinised and dismissed: 1.The teacher who claims omniscience. 2.The traditionalist. 3.The rationalist. 4.The sceptic.

In the Mahāsīhanāda Sutta the Buddha tells the venerable Sāriputta of another form of *brahmachariya* which he himself is said to have practised. It also, no doubt, stands outside the pale of Buddhism. It was a form of severe asceticism characterised by fourfold austerities such as abstemious partaking of food, seeking the solitude of forest retreats, etc.¹

Buddhaghosa places before us a list in which he tries to indicate the connotation of the term *brahmachariya* in different circles at different times. He says: `This term *brahmachariya*

¹ *Abhijānāmi kho panā'haṃ sāriputta caturaṅgasamannāgataṃ brahmachariyaṃ caritā: tapassī sudaṃ homi paramatapassī lūkhassudaṃ homi paramalūkho jegucchī sudaṃ homi paramajegucchī pavivitta'ssudaṃ homi paramapavivitto - M.I.77.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

here is used in the following senses.¹ But one is not quite sure whether Buddhaghosa refers to the use of the term only in Buddhism. What is clear from the evidence of Buddhaghosa is that brahmachariya in all these cases, not necessarily Buddhist, meant virtuous living. But the concept and magnitude of virtue apparently varied. Here are the different applications of the term according to Buddhaghosa:

dāna - charity.

veyyāvaccā - rendering a service or being dedicated to.

pañcasikkhāpadasīla - observance of the five precepts.

appamaññā - practice of brahmavihāra.

methunavirati - celibacy.

sadārasantosa - chastity.

virīya - striving.

uposathaṅga - observance of the full-day of the fast.

ariyamagga - the noble path.

sāsana - the complete Buddhist way of life.

While some of these practices may fall in line with the Buddhist concept of morality still there is evidence to show that

¹ *Ettha pana ayaṃ brahmachariyasaddo... imesu atthesu dissati - DA.I.177.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

at least a few of these forms of *brahmachariya* were not at all Buddhist in outlook. Illustrating the use of the term *brahmachariya* in the sense of *viriya* or striving Buddhaghosa refers to the Lomahaṃsana Sutta¹ which is the same as the Mahāsīhanāda Sutta which was quoted earlier. There the Buddha describes the fourfold austerities which he had practised. Those debased practices with regard to food, lodgings etc. as they are described in the Sutta are evidently among those which the Buddha rejects in more places than one. We discover clear proof of this as we examine the story in the Jātaka collection which goes by the same name, namely the Lomahaṃsana Jātaka.² The Jātaka story which summarises the contents of the Lomahaṃsana Sutta³ goes into great detail in the narration of the story. Perhaps, in an attempt to avoid any mistaken association of these practices with what were genuinely Buddhist, the Jātaka story makes the Buddha state that he practised these austerities to see whether there was any

¹ *Abhijānāmi kho panā'haṃ sārīputta caturaṅgasamannāgataṃ brahmachariyaṃ caritā tapassi sudaṃ homī'ti lomahaṃsanāsutte viriyaṃ brahmachariyan'ti vuttaṃ* - DA.I.179.

² J.I.390.

³ Lomahaṃsana Sutta = Mahāsīhanāda Sutta - M.I.77.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

value in them.¹ It is further added that these constituted a form of Ājīvaka life.² Thereafter the Jātaka story goes on to stigmatise these practices completely by stating that these practices invariably lead to birth in hell.³

Buddhism seems to have found in the setting in which it grew up a number of terms of very great popularity and wide acceptance. Their connotations had been established through continued usage and as religious concepts they had reached an unchallenged position. The term Brahma and its derivatives seem to occupy the foremost place among them and they are our main interest here. In the Upaniṣadic schools of thought the Highest Being, Brahman, is sometimes conceived personally and at other times as an Impersonal Absolute.⁴ To reach it and be merged in it or be identified with it was the aim of all their

¹ *Atthi nu kho ettha sāro'ti bāhirakamicchātapaṃ vīmaṃsanto caturaṅgasamannāgataṃ brahmacariyavāsaṃ vasim* - J.I.390

² *...bāhirakatapaṃ vīmaṃsissāmī'ti ājīvakapabbajjaṃ pabbajivā acelako ahoṣi*. Ibid.

³ *Evaṃ caturaṅgasamannāgataṃ pana brahmacariyaṃ caritvā bodhisatto maraṇakāle upaṭṭhitaṃ nirayanimittaṃ disvā idaṃ vata samdānaṃ niratthakan'ti ñatvā taṃ khaṇaṅñ'eva taṃ laddhiṃ bhindivā sammādiṭṭhiṃ gahetvā devaloke nibbatti* - Ibid.

⁴ See *Supra* p.22.n.3.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

religious endeavours. It is as the fountain-head of all existence that Brahman was accorded this position. Brahman is believed to be the source whence everything originated.¹ In the more developed later Upaniṣadic thought we get a pantheistic conception where Brahman is identified with the universe.² Buddhism too, seems to use the term Brahma to mean the Highest and the Perfect, but apparently with none of the theological and metaphysical associations. The term is always defined by Buddhaghosa in this sense, giving the word *brahma* the meaning of *seṭṭha*. The Buddha, however, was aware of the earlier connotations of the term. This becomes quite evident in the new definitions and explanations which the Buddha offers to the exponents of these ideas.

In the Saṃyutta, the Buddha is seen giving a new interpretation which accords with his teaching to the Brahmanic concept of Brahma-reaching. He tells the Brahmins that it is essentially based on moral achievements like honesty, self-restraint and holy life: *Saccaṃ dhammo saṃyamo*

¹ Brh.3.6; Tait.2.6; Chānd.6.3. See Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*. p.21f.

² Chānd.3.14; Kaṭha.5.2; Muṇḍ.2.2.11; Māṇḍ.2.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

brahmachariyaṃ majjhe sitā brāhmaṇa brahmapatti.¹ In Buddhism these concepts of 'Becoming Brahma' (*brahmabhūta*) and 'Attaining Brahma' (*brahmapatti*) had no associations of a higher power, an absolute with which an alliance was sought. As far as the Buddha was concerned, these terms implied only the attainment of the goal, the perfection of the religious life which he propounded. It is the enlightenment which leads to perfect liberation from the cycle of *saṃsāra*. It is also the purge of all the defiling traits of human life which hence comes to be called *āsavānaṃ khaya*. The Buddha, while he was once resting in a forest glade, was asked by Bhāradvājagotta Brāhmaṇa whether he was there practising austerities (*tapas*) in order to reach Brahma (*brahmapattiyā*) and to gain companionship with him (*lokādhipatisahavyataṃ ākaṅkhamāno*).² The Commentary on the above passage gives the concept of Brahma here the more personal character by explaining *lokādhipatisahavyataṃ* as *lokādhipatimahābrahmunā sahabhāvaṃ*.³ We have already observed that such a concept of Brahman was not unknown

¹ S.I.169.

² Ibid.180.

³ SA.I.265.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

among the Brahmins. The Buddha, in his reply to the Brahmin, not only points out that as Buddha he is supremely enlightened and possesses a clarified vision into the nature of all things, but also indicates the way whereby he attained to that state. This shows that the talk of Brahma-reaching in the way in which the Brahmins understood it had no relevance to the Buddha or to the religious life he advocated. What the Buddha valued most was his victory in the battle against craving and desire which are rooted in ignorance. Freed from craving and desire, and seeing things in their true perspective, the Buddha is wise and enlightened. He is happy and for him there are no further attainments beyond this.¹

But on the other hand, we notice that the concept of 'Becoming Brahma' (*brahmabhūta* and *brahmabhūya*) as found in the Bhagavadgītā is always coupled with the idea of identification of the individual self with Brahman. The consequence of this seems to be the final mergence of the *ātman* in *Brahman* which the Gītā refers to as *Brahmanirvāṇa*.² A commentarial note explains this clearly. With remarkable consistency the term *brahmabhūta* is defined in a number of

¹ S.I.180.

² *Bhagavadgītā*.5.24.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

places in more or less identical terms which amounts to an identification of oneself with Brahman.¹ Similar observations are made in the comment on *brahmabhūta*.² *Brahmabhūta* is also defined as the reciprocal identification of *Brahman* and *ātman*.³ It should also be noted that the Gītā too, like Buddhism, reckons with moral values.⁴ But these are subordinated to the absolutism of its Brahma ideal.

In Buddhism, the term *brahmabhūta* is used in two different contexts. It is used with reference to the Buddha along with a host of other attributes which describe him as a wise and reliable teacher.⁵ In all instances, the term *brahmabhūta* as an epithet of the Buddha is closely associated with the term *dhammabhūta*. In the Aggañña Sutta, these two terms are

¹ *Srīmadbhagavadgītārthaprakāśikā* (Adyar Library ed.), p.168.

² Ibid.446. See. Gītā.18.53.

³ *Brahmabhūtamiti brahmāhameva brahmeti brahmātmatvena siddho brahmabhūtah. Srīmadbhagavadgītārthaprakāśikā*, 189.

⁴ *Ahaṃkāraṃ balaṃ darpaṃ kāmaṃ krodhaṃ parigrahaṃ vimucya nirmamaḥ śānto brahmabhūyāya kalpate – Gītā.18.53.*

⁵ *Addhāvauso kaccāna bhagavā jānaṃ jānāti passaṃ passati cakkhubhūto ñāṇabhūto dhammabhūto brahmabhūto vattā pavattā atthassa ninnetā amatassa dātā dhammassāmī tathāgato – M.I.111; III.195, 224; S.IV.94.*

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

declared to be epithets of the Buddha and are associated with two other terms derived from the same concepts of Dhamma and Brahma.¹ The Buddha is also described as *dhammakāyo* and *brahmakāyo*. He is the symbol of the Dhamma (*dhammakāyo*) and he is identified with it. Hence th is also *dhammabhūto*. The Commentary on the above passage adds that the Dhamma, on account of its supreme nature, is called Brahma which is the recognised and accepted term to signify the highest and the perfect in contemporary religious thought. Here comes the identification of Dhamma with Brahma and perhaps this gave further support for the adoption of the term Brahma by the Buddhists to describe their own state of religious perfection.² Now it becomes clear that the term *brahmabhūta* is used to stress the Buddha's perfection and pre-eminence. The Commentaries regularly explain it as *seṭṭhabhūta: Seṭṭhatṭhena brahmabhūto* -MA.II.76. It is also used as an attribute of the Arahant, i.e. the disciple who, in this very life, has reached

¹ *Tathāgatassa h'etaṃ vāsettha adhvācanaṃ dhammakāyo itipi brahmakāyo itipi dhammabhūto itipi brahmabhūto itipi* - D.III.84.

² *Iti dhammakāyo assā'ti dhammakāyo. Dhammakāyattā eva brahmakāyo. Dhammo hi seṭṭhatṭhena brahmā'ti vuccati. Dhammabhūto hi dhammasabhāvo. Brahmabhūtattā eva brahmabhūto* - DA.III.865.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

peace and perfection, is tranquil and blissful.¹ Here too, the idea does not seem to be far from what was stated above, for it seems to emphasise the transcendent character of the Arahant as compared with the rest of the worldlings.² But neither in the descriptions of the spiritual progress of one who aspires to Arahantship nor in the accounts of the achievements and attainments of the Arahant do we ever get any associations with Brahma, personal or impersonal, as the highest and the absolute.

The term Brahma, however, does appear in Buddhism in such contexts as *brahmachariya*, *brahmabhūta* and *brahmapatti*. Here the term connotes only the idea of noble, worthy and supreme. It is this same phenomenon of adapting terms with already established connotations that we find in the use of the

¹ *Tassa evaṃ jānato evaṃ passato kāmāsavā'pi cittaṃ vimuccati bhavāsavā'pi cittaṃ vimuccati avijjāsavā'pi cittaṃ vimuccati vimuttasmim vimuttan'ti nāṇaṃ hoti khīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmachariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ itthattāyā'ti pajānāti. Ayaṃ vuccati bhikkhave puggalo nev'attantapo nāttapariṭāpanānuyogaṃ anuyutto na parantapo na parapariṭāpanānuyogaṃ anuyutto. So anattantapo aparantapo diṭṭh'eva dhamme nicchāto nibbuto sītibhūto sukhaṭṭhisamvedī brahmabhūtena attanā viharati - M.I.384. 413.*

² *Loke anūpalittā te brahmabhūtā anāsavā - S.III.83.*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

word *brāhmaṇa* with reference to the worthy Buddhist disciple.¹ During the days of the Buddha, the Brahmins as a group had attained an unassailable position in society, and the Buddha too, seems to have conceded this up to a point. He always had a word of praise for those whom he called the virtuous Brahmins of old. His lament was that the Brahmins of his day did not live up to the worthy Brahmin ideals set up by the ancestors of the clan.² The following are some of the virtues he ascribed to them: `The sages of yore were full of restraint and given to austerity. Rejecting the pleasures of the senses they sought their own salvation.³ `They considered the life of *brahmachariya*, morality, honesty, austerity, benevolence, compassion and tolerance as great virtues.⁴ It would have been both futile and almost impossible to dislodge the Brahmin from the social position which he had acquired for himself. The

¹ See Dhammapada, vv.397ff. Brāhmaṇavagga.

*Sabbasamyojanaṃ chetvā yo ve na paritassati saṅgātigaṃ
visamyuttaṃ tamaḥaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ, etc.etc.*

² Sn.p.50f.

³ *Isayo pubbakā āsuṃ saññatattā tapassino pañcakāmaguṇe hitvā
attadatthaṃ acārisum* - Sn.v.284.

⁴ *Brahmachariyañ ca sīlañ ca ajjavaṃ maddavaṃ tapaṃ soraccaṃ
avihiṃsañ ca khantiñ cāpi avaṇṇayaṃ* - Ibid.v.292.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

Buddha accepted the concept of the ideal Brahmin and redefined the qualifications for the title of Brāhmaṇa with the stress on ethics and morality. He challenged the accepted value attached to birth as the exclusive qualification for Brahminship.¹ It is the mode of a man's life, according to the Buddha's new criterion, that determines a man's social and religious pre-eminence.²

It is not the purpose of the present study to go into details of the development of Buddhist cosmological ideas. However, it must be mentioned that Buddhist texts know of references to Brahmā as a personal being. He is referred to as Mahābrahmā and is recognised as the head of the thousand world systems.³ But the interest of the Buddhist texts here is not so much to stress the greatness of Brahmā as to show that he himself is

¹ *Na jaccā brāhmaṇo hoti na jaccā hoti abrāhmaṇo kammanā brāhmaṇo hoti kammanā hoti abrāhmaṇo* - Ibid.v.650.

² *Kammanā vattatī loko kammanā vattatī pajā kammanibandhanā sattā rathassāṇīva yāyato* - Ibid.v.654.

Tapena brahmācāriyena samyamena damena ca etena brāhmaṇo hoti etaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ uttamaṃ Ibid.v.655.

³ *Yāvatā bhikkhave sahaṣṣīlokadhātu mahābrahmā tattha aggaṃ akkhāyati* - A.V.59f.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

subject to the law of change and therefore is not an ideal or absolute position to aspire to, although it is, no doubt, regarded as a very high one.¹ According to the Buddhist texts, it is to this great Brahmā that the Brahmins of the day addressed their prayers and sacrifices.² It is a very ritualistic Brahmanism that is portrayed here. It is centered on the cult of a personal Brahma. The world of Brahmā was the religious goal of the Brahmins and companionship with him was the consummation of their religious life. The Brahmins themselves are seen professing it to be so.³ A passage from the Dhānañjāni Sutta makes it further clear that this was the manner in which the Buddhists explained the position of the Brahmins of the day who aspired to reach the world of Brahma (*brahmalokādhimuttā*).⁴ Here the Buddha

¹ *Mahābrahmuno'pi kho bhikkhave atth'eva aññatattaṃ atthi vipariṇāmo. Evaṃ passaṃ bhikkhave sutavā ariyasāvako tasmim'pi nibbindati tasmim' nibbindanto agge virajjati pageva hīnasmim - Ibid.*

² *Dūre ito brāhmaṇī brahmaloko yassāhutiṃ paggaṇhāsi niccaṃ - S.I.141.*

³ *Ayameva ujumaggo ayam añjasāyano niyyāniko niyyāti takkarassa brahmasahavyatāya. Sv'āyam akkhāto brāhmaṇena pokkharasātinā'ti - D.I.236.*

⁴ *Mayham kho bhante evam ahosi ime kho brāhmaṇā brahmalokādhimuttā. Yannūnā'haṃ dhānañjāniṃ brāhmaṇaṃ*

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

questions the venerable Sāriputta why he aided Dhānañjāni to be born in the Brahma-world which according to the religious considerations of the Buddhists was an inferior goal. But in the Tevijjā Sutta, the Buddha himself, being questioned by the Brahmin pupils of Pokkharasāti and Tārukka, is seen redefining the path to the world of Brahmā and the way to Brahma-union.¹ What strikes us in both these instances is that birth in the world of Brahmā as a reward for the practice of the religious life is conceded. However, nowhere is it recognised as the final end. On the other hand, the Buddha asks Sāriputta why he set Dhānañjāni in the world of Brahmā when something further could have been achieved (*sati uttariṃ karaṇīye*).² Brahmā himself is declared to be subject to change (*mahābrahmuno'pi atth'eva aññattattaṃ atthi vipariṇāmo*).³ Consequently a high premium is never set on life in the Brahma-world for the Buddhists who always regard it as a

brahmānaṃ saḥavyatāya maggaṃ deseṣṣan'ti - M.II.195f.

¹ *Sutaṃ me'taṃ bho gotama samaṇo gotamo brahmānaṃ saḥavyatāya maggaṃ deseṣī'ti. Sādhu no bhavaṃ brahmānaṃ saḥavyatāya maggaṃ desetu ullumpatu bhavaṃ gotamo brāhmaṇiṃ pajan'ti* - D.I.249.

² M.II.195.

³ A.V.59f.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

relatively inferior position in relation to *nibbāna* (*hīne brahmaloke*).¹

At the same time we notice that the idea of birth in the Brahma-world is closely bound up with the practice and development of the four virtues of *mettā*, *karuṇā*, *muditā* and *upekkhā* which in Buddhism have come to be known as the four Brahma-vihāra or divine abodes. However, in the early texts the term Brahma-vihāra is not always used for the practice of these virtues. The Saṅgīti Sutta refers to them as *catasso appamaññāyo* or the fourfold boundlessness.² In the Dhānañjāni Sutta, it is the practice of these four virtues which the venerable Sāriputta recommends to the Brahmin Dhānañjāni as the way to reach the Brahma-world. Each one of these is spoken of as leading to that much coveted goal.³ Here, the practice of the Brahma-vihāra seems to stand on its own without any leanings on Buddhism, except for the fact that the Sutta simply says that a Bhikkhu does practise these. Dhānañjāni was thus able, apparently without any radical change of his ways, to practise it in his Brahmin setting and be

¹ M.II.195.

² D.III.223.

³ *Ayam pi kho dhānañjāni brahmānaṃ saḥavyatāya maggo* - M.II.195.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

born in the Brahma-world. In the Tevijjā Sutta, the position is different. It is admitted that the development of these practices leads to Brahma-companionship, but it is to come only after the fulfilment of the preliminary duties which are to be carried out by a Buddhist disciple. The grounding in morality (*sīlakkhanda*), restraint of the sense faculties (*indriyasamvara*), mental alertness (*satisampajañña*) and contentment (*santuṭṭhi*) are all basic requirements, possessed of which the Buddhist disciple is to purge his mind of the five evil traits (*pañcanīvaraṇa*). Then alone has he reached the necessary mental poise for the effective practice of the above virtues referred to as Brahma-vihāra. We see in this Sutta the practice of the Brahma-vihāra adequately garbed in Buddhist fashion, even though it is recognised that this practice leads to Brahma-companionship.¹ This being so, no difficulty of incompatibility seems to be encountered here.²

¹ D.I.250f.

² *So vata vāseṭṭha apariggaho averacitto avyāpajjacitto asaṅkilittḥacitto vasavatti bhikkhu kāyassa bheda parammaraṇā apariggahassa... vasavattissa brahmuno saavyūpago bhavissatīti thānaṃ etaṃ vijjati* - D.I.252.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

But in the Makhādeva Sutta, the Brahma-vihāra are valued differently. King Makhādeva who is recognised as the Buddha in one of his earlier existences, is said to have renounced the household life at the first appearance of the signs of old age. Living the life of *brahmācārya*, he practised not one, but all the four Brahma-vihāra and after death was born in the Brahma-world.¹ But after he became the Buddha, he was in a position to point out the limitations of the practice of the Brahma-vihāra as a way of religious life. It leads not to detachment, tranquility and cessation. It leads not to enlightenment but only confers birth in the Brahma-world. The Buddha is happy to be able to offer a new way of religious life which leads to detachment, cessation and tranquility. It is the way to enlightenment which is none other than the noble eightfold path.² We notice that there is a definite attempt in this Sutta (Tevijja) to reject this alien way of the practice of Brahma-vihāra, with its limitations, perhaps

¹ *Rājā kho panānanda makhādevo.... agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajito brahmācāryaṃ cari. So cattāro brahmavihāre bhāvetvā kāyassa bhedaṃ parammaraṇā brahmalokūpago ahoṣi* - M.II.76.

² *Katamañc'ānanda etarahi mayā kalyāṇaṃ vaṭṭaṃ nihitaṃ ekanta-nibbidāya virāgāya nirodhāya upasamāya abhiññāya sambodhāya nibbānāya samvattati. Ayam'eva ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo seyyathīdaṃ sammādiṭṭhi... sammāsamādhī* - M.II.82.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

because of its strong ties with the Brahma-world, the relative inferiority of which the Buddha repeatedly stressed. The scope of the religious life of a Buddhist disciple would not only thereby be limited but also misdirected. The same criticism is made when a Buddhist disciple practises the life of *brahmachariya*, aspiring to be born in a particular heavenly world. The Cetokhila Sutta considers it a definite hindrance to spiritual progress.¹

However, the virtues developed under the Brahma-vihāra are in no way incompatible with the spiritual progress of a Buddhist disciple. They are, in fact, associated with the Buddha too. In the Jīvaka Sutta, Jīvaka tells the Buddha about these four virtues which are believed to be characteristics of Brahmā and adds that he feels that the Buddha also possesses them. The Buddha admits that he possesses them but not as the result of a direct process of practice. On the other hand, it is by virtue of the fact that *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* are completely eliminated in the Buddha. For it is these which give rise to *vyāpāda*, *viheṣā*, *arati* and *paṭigha* which are the opposites of

¹ *Puna ca paraṃ bhikkhave bhikkhu aññataraṃ devanikāyaṃ panidhāya brahmachariyaṃ carati iminā'haṃ sīlena vā vatena vā brahmachariyena vā devo vā bhavissāmi devaññataro vā'ti... evaṃ assāyaṃ pañcama cetaso vinibandho asamucchinnō hoti* - M.I.102.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

these four virtues.¹ Thus, in him they are only derivative virtues resulting from a higher achievement. But the Buddha speaks of his disciples as developing these virtues in their daily life.² In the Mahārāhulovāda Sutta, the disciples are asked to develop these with the primary idea of eliminating their opposites, viz. *vyāpāda*, *vihesā*, *arati* and *paṭigha*.³ The Commentary adds that these virtues are essential as the means to the attainment of Arahantship.⁴ We notice here an attempt to offer a different motive which is more in keeping with Buddhist values for the practice of these much recognised virtues. It is particularly interesting to note how the elimination of *arati* is held out as an incentive for the practice of *muditā*.

The explanation of *arati* as given in the Commentaries gives the virtue of *muditā* an essentially monastic character which it

¹ *Yena kho jīvaka rāgena yena dosena yena mohena vyāpādavā assa so rāgo so doso so moho tathāgatassa pahīno ucchinnamūlo tālavatthukato anabhāvakato āyatim anuppādadammo. Sace kho te jīvaka idaṃ sandhāya bhāsitaṃ anujānāmi te etan'ti* - Ibid.369f.

² Ibid.38,297,369.

³ Ibid.424.

⁴ *Mettaṃ rāhulā'ti kasmā ārabhi... Mettādibhāvanāya pana hotī'ti tādibhāvassa kāraṇadassanattaṃ imaṃ desanaṃ ārabhi* - MA.III.140.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

need not necessarily have. *Arati* is accordingly the apathy and indifference to the cloistered life and the lack of initiative in the striving for higher spiritual attainments.¹ Also note the comment on *arati* which is given in the Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakathā. There it is indicated that the *pabbajita*, even after the conquest of *kāma* on entering the monastic life, may yet fall a victim to *arati* if he fails to engage himself actively in the pursuit of the monastic aspirations.² As we examine the interpretation given here to *muditā* and *arati* with this distinctly monastic bias we begin to see that the Brahma-vihāra which originally were meant to bring about a mental purge and secure an equipoise of mind are also being used to serve partly as a stimulant in Buddhist monasticism. There is a statement in the Saṃyutta Nikāya which tries to make out that the difficult task for a *pabbajita* is the devotion and dedication to his mission of good monastic

¹ *Aratī'ti arati pantasenāsanesu c'eva adhikusalesu dhammesu ca ukkaṇṭhitatā* - Ibid.

² *Tattha yasmā ādito'va agāriyabhūte satte vatthukāmesu kilesakāmā mohayanti te abhibhuyya anagāriyabhāvaṃ upagatānaṃ pantesu vā senāsanesu aññataraññataresu vā adhikusalesu dhammesu arati uppajjati. Vuttañ c'etaṃ pabbajitena kho āvuso abhirati dukkarā'ti-* SnA.II.389.

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

living.¹ The Saṃyutta has repeated laments over the falling standards of the Buddhist Saṅgha and we may safely infer that this statement reflects a similar attitude.² At such a stage in the history of the order it is understandable that *muditā* is called upon to play this additional role of battling against spiritual lethargy and indifference.

The practice of these four virtues is also called *appamāṇā cetovimutti* and this *cetovimutti* is esteemed high in so far as it is stable and has led in that state of mental perfection to the elimination of *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha*.³ Of these four, *mettā* alone as a virtue by itself, is advocated by the Buddha in the Kakacūpama Sutta. This sermon which refers to the elimination of feelings of anger under all circumstances became, more or less, a standard injunction to his disciples. They are called upon

¹ *Pabbajitena panāvuso kim dukkaran'ti. Pabbajitena kho āvuso abhirati dukkarā'ti* - S.IV.260.

² S.II.206, 208, 218, 267.

³ *Idhāvuso bhikkhu mettāsahagatena.... upekkhāsahagatena cetasā ekaṃ disaṃ pharivā viharati.....Ayaṃ vuccat'āvuso appamāṇā cetovimutti. Yāvatā kho āvuso appamāṇā cetovimuttiyo akuppā tāsā cetovimutti aggaṃ akkhāyati. Sā kho pana akuppā cetovimutti suññā rāgena suññā dosena suññā mohena* - M.I.297f.

Chapter II - Brahmācārya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

to bear in mind the simile of the saw (*kakacūpama*) at all times.¹ Consequently it became a guiding principle in their life as is borne out by the Theragāthā.² The Māgha Sutta too, seems to single out *mettā* as a virtue to be developed by the Buddhist disciple.³ The Metta Sutta goes further to recommend the development of *mettā* and calls it, in its isolation, the Brahma-vihāra.⁴

The Aṭṭhakanāgara Sutta points out that a disciple, realising the limitations of the mental purge resulting from the practice of these virtues under the Brahma-vihāra, would be propelled thereby to strive for further attainments.⁵ Thus it becomes

¹ Ibid.129.

² *Uppajjate sace kodho āvajja kakacūpamaṃ* - Thag.v.445. See also M.I.189.

³ *So vītarāgo pavineyya dosaṃ mettaṃ cittaṃ bhāvayaṃ appamāṇaṃ rattim divaṃ sataṃ appamatto sabbā disā pharate appamaññaṃ* - Sn.v.507.

⁴ *Mettañca sabbalokasmiṃ mānasaṃ bhāvaye aparimāṇaṃ* - Sn.v.150.

.....*brahman etaṃ vihāraṃ idha-m-āhu* - Sn.v.151.

⁵ *Puna ca paraṃ gahapati bhikkhu mettā-sahagatena... upekkhā-sahagatena cetasā ekaṃ disaṃ pharivā viharati.... So iti paṭisañcikkhati ayam'pi kho upekkhā-cetovimutti abhisankhatā*

Chapter II - Brahmacharya: The Quest for Emancipation and Immortality

abundantly clear that in spite of the allusions to their transcendent character the Brahma-vihāra have only a limited significance in Buddhism in relation to the Buddhist life of *brahmachariya*.

*abhisāñcetayitā. Yaṃ kho pana kiñci abhisāṅkhatam
abhisāñcetayitam tadaniccam nirodhadhamman'ti pajānāti. So tatha
ṭhito... anuttaram yoggakkhemam anupāpunāti - M.I.351.*

CHAPTER III

The Early Buddhist Ideal of The Monk

The Buddha, who discovered the path to enlightenment after a successful process of trial and elimination, proclaims a new way of religious life which he recommends to his followers under the name of *brahmacariya*.¹ We find that as the goal of this life of *brahmacariya*, the accent falls on the release from *dukkha*² and the attainment of *nibbāna*. This is clear from the recurring statement in the texts which is ascribed to the Buddha: 'Come. O monk, live the life of *brahmacariya* in order that you may make an end of suffering' (*Ehi bhikkhū'ti bhagavā avoca svākkhāto dhammo. Cara brahmacariyaṃ sammā*

¹ *So dhammaṃ deseti ādikalyāṇaṃ majjhakalyāṇaṃ
pariyosānakalyāṇaṃ sātthaṃ sabyañjanaṃ kevalaparipuṇṇaṃ
parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ pakāseti* - D.I.62; M.I.179, 267 etc.

² Dukkha: This is a word whose meaning in Buddhism is so wide that it cannot easily be given in a single word like pain, suffering, or sorrow. Sometimes the word Ill is used to cover the totality of its connotation. Each one of these words can be regarded as being valid in its own context. The word 'unsatisfactoriness' is now believed to be having a very satisfactory coverage of the concept *dukkha*.

dukkhassa antakiriyāyā'ti -Vin.I.12.).¹ This orientation is due to the fact that the Bodhisatta's search for enlightenment derived its urge from his consuming anxiety to discover the root-cause of the phenomenon of *dukkha* and the way to its extinction [*dukkhañ cāhaṃ paññāpemi dukkhassa ca nirodhaṃ*]²

The Bodhisatta seems to have analysed the problem of *dukkha* in terms of its origin (*samudaya*) and its cessation (*nirodha*).³ Through this, it is not difficult to see the emergence of the Noble Truths or *Ariya-saccāni* as a part of the basic doctrines of Buddhism. This quest of the Bodhisatta resulted in the discovery of the ultimate cause of *dukkha* and hence of its cessation too, a discovery which he made following the principle of causal genesis (*idappaccayatā paṭicca-samuppādo*). From this, the evolution of the Chain of Causation

¹ See also S.II.24.

² Op.cit.10-11

³ *Tassa mayham bhikkave yoniso manasikārā ahu paññāya abhisamayo avijjāya kho sati saṅkhārā honti avijjā paccayā saṅkhārā'ti. Iti h'idaṃ avijjāpaccayā saṅkhārā saṅkhārapaccayā viññāṇaṃ..... Evam etassa kevalassa dukkhakkhandhassa samudayo hoti... Evam etassa kevalassa dukkhakkhandhassa nirodho hoti* - S.II.10f.

would have naturally resulted. In the *Sammādiṭṭhi Sutta*,¹ the venerable Sāriputta defines *dukkha* and analyses it in terms of its origin, cessation and the path leading to its cessation. Thereafter, he defines likewise the twelve links of the Paṭiccasamuppāda chain and analyses each one of them in turn in the same manner. In this analysis of Sāriputta we see an extended use of the Buddha's idea of causal genesis. Here too the successive links of the chain follow, as it were, from an analysis of *dukkha*.

Thus it is clear that the fact of *dukkha* was the starting-point of the Bodhisatta's journey of discovery of the causative links. As Buddha, he makes this point crystal clear in more than one place. Thus he tells the venerable Anurādha: 'One thing do I teach, suffering and the cessation of suffering' (*Sādhu sādhu anurādha pubbe cā'ham anurādha etarahi ca dukkhañ c'eva paññāpemi dukkhassa ca nirodhan'ti* -S.IV.384. See also M.I.140.). Nothing could have been a more realistic approach to *mokṣa* or deliverance than an awareness of the presence of suffering and a desire to terminate it. Even in his first sermon to the Pañcavaggiya monks,² the Buddha discoursed on *dukkha* and the escape therefrom. This is so fundamentally the

¹ M.I.46f.

² Vin.I.10.

dominant theme of Buddhism that even the philosophical expositions of *nibbāna* savour of this. They describe *nibbāna* as being the termination of *dukkha*: *es'ev'anto dukkhassa.*(*Atthi bhikkhave tadāyatanaṃ yattha n'eva pathavī na āpo... es'ev'anto dukkhassā'ti... etc. -Ud.80f.*)

This current life, associated together with the idea of many more repeated existences, appeared to the Bodhisatta as but a single link in the continuous chain of births and deaths, holding between them decay and disease as inescapable consequences. These ills of life, which the Bodhisatta observed around him, stand out as the first promptings which stirred him to the quest of a way of release from them.¹ The inquiry which he initiated and the results he achieved have become so significant in the history of Buddhism that these researches have been referred retrospectively to times anterior to Buddha Gotama.² They are ascribed to all the six Buddhas of the past who are listed together in the Mahāpadāna Sutta.³ All these Buddhas seem to make the same observation regarding life in

¹ S.II.10.

² Op.cit.5.

³ D.II.1f. They are Vipassi, Sikkhī, Vessabhū, Kakusandha, Konāgamaṇa and Kassapa and conform, more or less, to the pattern of the historical Buddha Gotama.

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

the world, namely, that the world is subject to the ills of birth, decay and death with the threatening reality of birth again in another existence. `And to me, brethren, before I was enlightened, while I was yet unenlightened and only a Bodhisatta, there came this thought: Alas! this world has fallen upon trouble. There is getting born and decaying and dying and passing away and being reborn. And yet from this suffering, from decay and death, an escape is not known. O when shall escape from this suffering, from decay and death, be revealed? Then to me, brethren, came this thought, What now being present, does decay and death come to be? What conditions decay and death?'¹

The theory of causal genesis in Buddhism was therefore a direct outcome of this probe and it is little wonder that the venerable Assaji, who was one of the first five disciples of the

¹ *Pubbe'va me bhikkhave sambodhā anabhisambuddhassa bodhisattassa sato etadahosi. Kiccham vatā'yam loko āpanno jāyati ca jīyati ca mīyati ca cavati ca uppajjati ca. Atha ca pan'imassa dukkhassa nissaraṇam nappajānāti. Kudā'ssu nāma imassa dukkhassa nissaraṇam paññāyissati jarāmaraṇassā'ti. Tassa mayham bhikkhave etadahosi. Kimhi nu kho sati jarāmaraṇam hoti kiṃ paccayā jarāmaraṇan'ti - S.II.10.*

Buddha, gave this theory as the essence of his master's teaching:

*Ye dhammā hetuppabhavā tesam hetu tathāgato āha
tesañ ca yo nirodho evaṃvādī mahāsamaṇo'ti.*¹

In the Ariyapariyesana Sutta, the Buddha himself identifies the theory of causal genesis - *idappacayatā paṭiccasamuppādo*, a theory in terms of which phenomenal existence and all its concomitants are explained, as the central feature of his Dhamma. As the only complement to this the Sutta introduces the cessation of samsāric existence which is the goal in Buddhism - *nirodho nibbānaṃ*.² The words of Assaji are undoubtedly resonant of these two fundamental and correlated ideas of the Buddha's teaching. Thus, as already pointed out earlier, the four Truths of Buddhism including the way or *magga* (*dukkha-nirodhagāminī-paṭipadā*) and the Chain of Causation are products of the Buddha's application of the principle of

¹ Vin.I.40.

² *Adhigato kho me ayaṃ dhammo gambhīro duddaso duranubodho...
ālayaramāya kho pana pajāya ālayaratāya ālayasammuditāya
duddasaṃ idam ṭhānaṃ yadidaṃ idappaccayatā paṭiccasamuppādo
idam'pi kho ṭhānaṃ duddasaṃ yadidaṃ sabbasaṅkhārasamatho
sabbūpadhipaṭṭinissaggo taṇhakkhayo virāgo nirodho nibbānaṃ.*
M.I.167.

causal genesis to the problem of *dukkha*.¹ Therefore they are essentially of the very core of Buddhism. In the Mahāhatthipadopama Sutta, the venerable Sāriputta quotes the Buddha as having identified the Paṭiccasamuppāda with the whole of his teaching.² This same prestige for the Paṭiccasamuppāda is claimed with greater eloquence in the Mahānidāna Sutta.³

The problem of *dukkha* as envisaged by the Bodhisatta and analysed by him later in great detail is shown to be both varied and extensive. In addition to the physical changes of decay, disease and death which are inherent in the fact of birth and are aspects of the basic suffering in life,⁴ there are also other painful situations which are consequent on it. The Buddha, in

¹ See Mrs Rhys Davids, *Sākyā*, p.133f.

² *Vuttaṃ kho pan'etaṃ bhagavatā yo paticcasamuppādam passati so dhammaṃ passati yo dhammaṃ passati so paṭiccasamuppādaṃ passati'ti* - M.I.190.f. See Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Ibid*.

³ *Gambhīro c'āyaṃ ānanda paticcasamuppādo gambhīrāvabhāso ca. Etassa ānanda dhammassa ananubodhā appaṭivedhā evaṃ ayaṃ pajā tantākulakajātā gulāguṇṭhikajātā muñjababbajabhūtā apāyaṃ duggatiṃ samsāraṃ n'ātivattati* - D.II.55.

⁴ *Idaṃ kho pana bhikkhave dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ jāti'pi dukkhā jarā'pi dukkhā vyādhī'pi dukkhā maraṇaṃ'pi dukkhaṃ....Vin.I.10; S.V.420f.*

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

his first sermon at Isipatana, explained that all our relationships with the world outside which are based on strong likes and dislikes and perverted values also lead to *dukkha*. *Dukkha* is there defined as 'the company of those whom one does not like, separation from those whom one likes and the inability to gain the objects of desire.'¹ Cares and considerations of household life lead to numerous such instances. The Kāma Sutta of the Suttanipāta portrays some of these as follows:

Whoso for pleasure longs
And therein hath his will,
How happy is that man
With all he wished for won.

But when those pleasures fade,
The wanton wight, thus steeped
In pleasure, craving-born,
Suffers as pierced by dart.

Who craves for pleasure's brood:
Fields and demesnes and gold,

¹ *Appiyehi sampayogo dukkho piyehi vippayogo dukkho yaṃp'icchaṃ na labhati taṃpi dukkhaṃ saṅkhittena pañcupādānakkhandhāpi dukkhā* - Vin.I.10; S.V.420f.

Horses and cows and slaves,
Retainers, women, kin:

*Him weaknesses o'erpower,
Him troubles dominate,
And on him closes ill
As sea on vessel split.¹*

However, it is pointed out that these are situations which a wise man may discreetly avoid and keep away at a distance. The Mahādukkhakkhandha Sutta also discusses how the manifold implications of life bring *dukkha* in their wake, to a greater or lesser degree. These aspects of *dukkha*, man creates for himself to whatever degree he gives vent to his desires.² The burden of earning a livelihood, loss and failure, insecurity, interstate warfare, communal and family disputes, and acts of political violence are all listed in the Sutta as contributing their quota to the additional load of *dukkha* which man piles upon himself.

¹ Hare, *Woven Cadences*, SBB.XV. pp.115-6; Sn.vv.766,767,769,770.

² *Ayaṃ'pi bhikkhave kāmānaṃ ādīnava sandiṭṭhiko dukkhakkhandho kāmahetu kāmanidānaṃ kāmādhikaraṇaṃ kāmānaṃ eva hetu -*
M.I.85f.

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

Brahmacariya or the higher religious life which is often identified with the life of *pabbajjā* is held out in early Buddhism as the one certain way for the effective elimination of these ills of existence. The disciples of the Buddha, once being asked by the followers of other religious schools as to the purpose of Buddhist monastic life, answer that it aims at the termination of *dukkha*.

This reply of the disciples is heartily endorsed by the Master who maintains that it is the correct interpretation of his teaching. He is himself seen stating the same.¹ The following items are also added as motives for the practice of *brahmacariya*:

¹ *Idha no bhante aññatitthiyā paribbājakā amhe evaṃ pucchanti kimatthiyam āvuso samaṇe gotame brahmacariyaṃ vussatī'ti. Evaṃ puttā mayāṃ bhante tesam aññatitthiyānaṃ paribbājakānaṃ evaṃ vyākāroma dukkhassa kho āvuso pariññatthaṃ bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ vussatī'ti* - S.IV.51.

Elimination of lust - *rāgavirāgatthaṃ*

Removal of fetters of existence -

saṃyojanapahānatthaṃ

Destruction of predispositions -

anusayasamugghātathaṃ

Extinction of defilements - *āsavānaṃ khayatthaṃ*

Realisation of the fruits of release through wisdom -

vijjāvimutti phalasaṃcchikiriyatthaṃ

Realisation of knowledge and insight -

ñāṇadassanatthaṃ

Complete *liberation* from the whirl of existence -

*anupādā parinibbānatthaṃ*¹

Brahmacariya is the Buddhist way to perfection which is referred to as the attainment of *nibbāna*. The Mahāassapura Sutta states that the one concern of *brahmacariya* is the attainment of that poise and freedom of the mind which is *nibbāna*.² The Cullavedalla Sutta explains the purpose of *brahmacariya* as the attainment of *nibbāna*.³ The Saṃyutta

¹ S.V.27-29.

² *Yā ca kho ayaṃ bhikkhave akuppā cetovimutti etadatthaṃ bhikkhave brahmacariyaṃ etaṃ sāraṃ etaṃ pariyosānan'ti* - M.I.197.

³ *Nibbānogadhaṃ hi āvuso visākha brahmacariyaṃ nibbānaparāyanam nibbānapariyosānaṃ* - M.I.304. See also S.III.189;

explains further how the life of *brahmacariya* leads to the cessation of *dukkha*. Through the practice of *brahmacariya*, it says, rebirth is ended, and thereby one is freed of all consequent ills.¹ The above passage in the Samyutta strives hard to establish, in no uncertain terms, the essential connection between the practice of *brahmacariya* and the attainment of the Buddhist goal of terminating saṃsāric existence. The early Canonical texts repeatedly record that every Arahant, while declaring the fact of his enlightenment, claims that he would not be reborn again and that he has perfected the life of *brahmacariya*: *khīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ*.² He is also aware of the termination of his existence in *saṃsāra* which he has accomplished: *nāparaṃ itthattāyā'ti pajānāti*.³ This life of *brahmacariya* admits of no compromises and is described as a mode of life which is perfect

V.29.

¹ *Acari bhikkhave paṇḍito brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhakkhayāya. Tasmā paṇḍito kāyassa bheda na kāyūpago hoti. So akāyūpago samāno parimuccati jātiyā jarāmarañena sokehi paridevehi dukkhehi domanassehi upāyāsehi parimuccati dukkhasmā'ti vadāmi* - S.II.24-25.

² M.I.23,38,67; II.39,61. S.I.140.161; II.21-22; III.36.

³ *Ibid.*

and wholly pure: *ekantaparipuṇṇaṃ ekantaparisuddhaṃ saṅkhalikhiṭaṃ*.¹ There should be no erring even for a single day, says the Commentary.² The Commentaries go on to add that the life of *brahmacariya* is so called because it is the noblest way of life or the way of life of those who have reached the highest state of perfection.³ The Arahant is described as *brahmacariyassa kevalī* or one who has perfected the life of *brahmacariya*.⁴ The Commentary on the above adds that he is also called *sakalabrahmacārī*. *i.e.* a complete *brahmacārī*.⁵ As

¹ D.I.62; M.I.179,267,344.

² *Yad etaṃ sikkhattayaṃ brahmacariyaṃ ekaṃ'pi divasaṃ akhaṇḍaṃ katvā carimakacittaṃ pāpetabbatāya ekantaparipuṇṇaṃ ekadivasaṃ'pi ca saṅkilesamalena amalinaṃ katvā carimacittaṃ pāpetabbatāya ekantaparisuddhaṃ saṅkhalikhiṭaṃ likhitasāṅkhasadisasaṃ dhotasāṅkhasappaṭibhāgaṃ caritabbaṃ...*
MA.II.205.

³ *Brahmacariyan'ti seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmabhūtaṃ cariyaṃ brahmabhūtānaṃ vā buddhādīnaṃ cariyaṃ'ti vuttaṃ hoti* - DA.I.179;
MA.II.204.

⁴ *Pahīnajātīmaraṇo brahmacariyassa kevalī pannabhāro viṣaṃyutto katakicco anāsavo* - A.I.162.

⁵ *Brahmacariyassa kevalī'ti brahmacariyassa kevalena samannāgato paripuṇṇabhāvena yutto'i attho. Khīṇāsavo hi sakalabrahmacārī nāma hoti* - AA.II.258.

the complete way to salvation it is also said to embrace all three phases of *sikkhā* or self-culture in Buddhism, namely *sīla*, *samādhī* and *paññā*. i.e. morality, tranquility of mind and wisdom respectively.¹

It is in this sense, namely that *brahmacariya* is the way to Arahantship, that *brahmacariya* comes to be identified with the Noble Eightfold Path.² The Commentaries repeatedly speak of *brahmacariya* as the path leading to Arahantship.³ Thus it is undoubtedly the ideal religious life in Buddhism, recommended and practised for the attainment of the final goal.

The efficacy of this way of life is readily admitted by its adherents. The elder Puṇṇa Mantāniputta tells the venerable Sāriputta that the life of *brahmacariya* under the Buddha is lived for the sake of attaining complete emancipation: *Anupādā*

¹ *Evaṃ desento ca sikkhattaya-saṃgahitam*

sakalasāsanabrahmacariyaṃ pakāseti - DA.I.179.

² *Katamañ ca bhikkhave brahmacariyam. Ayaṃ eva ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko*

maggo seyyathidaṃ sammādiṭṭhi.....sammāsamādhī. Katamāni ca bhikkhave brahmacariyaphalāni. Sotāpatti-phalaṃ

arahattaphalaṃ. Imāni vuccanti bhikkhave brahmacariyaphalānīti - S.V.26.

³ *Arahattamaggasaṅkhātassa brahmacariyassa anuttaraṃ ogadham uttamapatiṭṭhābhūtaṃ nibbānaṃ* - AA.II.267.

parinibbānatthaṃ kho āvuso bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ vussati - M.I.148. The Buddhist disciple who has attained the goal of his quest, the Arahant, speaks of having perfected this higher life of *brahmacariya: vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ*. The pragmatism of the Buddha's teaching is clearly revealed in the statement that he preaches only what contributes to his life of *brahmacariya* and leaves unexplained that which has no relevance to it.¹ The life of *brahmacariya* amounts almost to complete renunciation in that all the followers of the Buddha are invariably found saying that this perfect and pure religious life cannot easily be lived while leading the life of a householder.² Thus the ardent convert is seen going from home to homelessness, with faith in the way of life laid down by the Buddha, for the purpose of perfecting this life of *brahmacariya*.³ The Pabbajjā Sutta of the Suttanipāta describes on very similar

¹ M.I.431.

² *Yathā yathā'haṃ bhante bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānāmi na'y'idaṃ sukaraṃ agāraṃ ajjhāvasatā ekantaparipuṇṇaṃ ekantaparissuddhaṃ saṅkhalikhitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ carituṃ. Icchāma'haṃ bhante kesamassaṃ ohāretvā kāsāyāni vattpāni acchādetvā agāraṃ mā anagāriyaṃ pabbajituṃ* - M.II.66 f.

³ *Yassatthāya kulaputtā sammadeva agāraṃ mā anagāriyaṃ pabbajanti tadanuttaraṃ brahmacariyapariyosānaṃ diṭṭhe'va dhamme sayāṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja vihāsi* - M.I.40,172,477.

lines the motive which prompted the Bodhisatta to renounce the household life.¹ It is at this point of emphasis of complete renunciation that *brahmacariya* and the life of *pabbajjā* seem almost to converge.

In describing the *sīla* observed by a *pabbajita*, Suttas go on to say that he is a *brahmacārī* in that he observes the vow of celibacy, having given up the life of *abrahmacariya* (non-*brahmacariya*) which is, more or less, identified with the sex life of a householder.² The Tissametteyya Sutta of the Suttanipāta³ sheds further light on the Buddhist monastic attitude to celibacy. Called upon by the elder Tissametteyya to explain the dangers of sex life to a monastic career, the Buddha says that the monk who indulges in the pleasures of sex (*methuna*) would, first and foremost, fail to fulfil his avowed mission.⁴ The Commentary

¹ *Pabbajjaṃ kittayissāmi yathā pabbaji cakkhumā yathā vīmaṃsamāno so pabbajjaṃ samarocayi. Sambādhō'yaṃ gharāvāso rajassāyatanaṃ iti abbhokāso ca pabbajjā iti disvāna pabbaji-*
Sn.vv.405-6.

² *Abrahmacariyaṃ pahāya brahmacārī hoti virato methunā gāmadhammā* - D.I.63; M.II.181; III.33.

³ Sn.vv.814f.

⁴ *Methunaṃ anuyuttassa metteyyā'ti bhagavā mussate'vā'pi sāsanaṃ*
- Sn.v.815.

explains this further as the failure to gain mastery over the Buddha's teaching (*pariyattisāsana*) and the inability to attain to any higher spiritual states (*paṭipattisāsana*).¹ He would also consequently slip into wrong patterns of conduct which are unworthy of the noble traditions of true monasticism.² It is also said to be despicable in the eyes of the public that one who had renounced everything and chosen a monastic career to lead a solitary life should be lured by thoughts of *methuna* or sex gratification. He would be looked upon as a carriage which has gone out of control, which ere long would go to wreck and ruin.³ Such a decline would be degrading and the Sutta goes on to say that these considerations should suffice as inducements for a monk to eschew such vulgar pleasures.⁴ On account of this monastic attitude to celibacy we discover in the Saṃyutta Nikāya what appears to be a fossilized idea which regarded

¹ *Mussatevā'pi sāsanan'ti dvīhi kāraṇehi sāsanaṃ mussati pariyattisāsanaṃ'pi mussati paṭipattisāsanaṃ'pi mussati* - Mahāniddeśa I.143f.

² *Micchā ca paṭipajjati etaṃ tasmim̐ anāriyam* - Sn.v.815.

³ *Eko pubbe caritvāna methunaṃ yo nisevati yānaṃ bhantaṃ va taṃ loke hīnaṃ āhu puthujjanaṃ* - Sn.v.816.

⁴ *Yaso kitti ca yā pubbe hāyatevā'pi tassa sā etaṃ'pi disvā sikkhetha methunaṃ vippahātave* - Sn.v.817.

women as a danger to the life of *brahmacariya*.¹ This latter attitude to women in Buddhism may also be partly derived from Jainism and from the Brahmacharya Āśrama of the Brahmins which we discussed earlier under the Upaniṣads.² But the really vital consideration, over and above all these, is the Buddhist attitude to the enjoyment of *kāma* or pleasures of the senses. The desire for their enjoyment, the Buddha has repeatedly stated, is contradictory to the spiritual aspirations of the monk.³

It is the celibacy and the good life of the monk that we have discussed so far, and thus *brahmacariya* remains as though it were the prerogative of the monk. However, in the Mahāvaccagotta Sutta we see the term *brahmacārī* being used with reference to laymen.⁴ The Pāsādika Sutta too, uses it

¹ *Itthī malaṃ brahmacariyassa etthā'yaṃ sajjate pajā* - S.I.38.

² *Supra* p.24.

³ *Sādhu bhikkhave sādhu kho me tumhe bhikkhave evaṃ dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānātha. Anekapariyāyena hi vo bhikkhave antarāyikā dhammā vuttā mayā alaṅ ca pana te paṭisevato antarāyāya. Appassādā kāmā vuttā mayā bahudukkhā bahūpāyāsā ādīnavo ettha bhiiyo* - M.I.133.

⁴ *upāsakā ca gihī odātavasanā brahmacārino ārādhakā upāsakā ca gihī odātavasanā kāmabhogino ārādhakā. Evaṃ idam brahmacariyaṃ paripūraṃ ten'arigena* - M.I.492.

in the same sense.¹ The essence of the term here, which is also applied to the white-clad laymen, is that a *brahmacārī* is one who has eschewed sensual pleasures. Hence he is not a *kāmabhogī*. The white-clad laymen who are *brahmacārī* are presented in marked contrast to the white-clad laymen who enjoy sensual pleasures.² This stresses the idea that the essence of *brahmacariya* is the spirit of complete renunciation. It is not the mere departure from home to homelessness but the surrendering of all the pleasures which are the lot of a householder. This detachment which is to be acquired through diligent cultivation is the fundamental characteristic of true *pabbajjā*. It is evident from the statement in the Saṃyutta which says that once the mind has achieved this detachment, the *pabbajita* would not exchange his mode of life for the lower order of the laymen.³

¹ *Santi kho pana me cunda etarahi upāsakā sāvakā gihī odātavasanā brahmacārino* - D.III.124.

² D.III.124. Also M.I.492.

³ *So vata bhikkhave bhikkhu evaṃ caranto evaṃ viharanto sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāyāvattissatīti n'etaṃ thānaṃ vijjati. Taṃ kissa hetu. yaṃ hi taṃ bhikkhave cittaṃ dīgharattaṃ vivekaninnaṃ vivekaponnaṃ vivekapabbhāraṃ taṃ vata hīnāya āvattissatīti n'etaṃ thānaṃ vijjati* - S.IV.191.

It is also clear from the testimony of the Suttas that the early disciples who took to the monastic life under the Buddha did so with a characteristic awareness and earnestness.¹ They admit that it is difficult for one who lives the life of a householder to practise this code of higher living.² The household, with its many-faceted activities could never provide the necessary leisure or freedom for its development. It is far from being the ideal setting for it. It is also said that the unstable and disquietening character of household life is enough in itself to drive a man to complete renunciation.³ The contrast between the two is emphatically stated in the following statement. 'Life in the household is full of impediments and leads to corruption. Life of mendicancy affords complete freedom': *Bahusambādho*

¹ *Idha pana bhikkhave ekacco kulaputto saddhā agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajito hoti otiṇṇo'mhi jātiyā jarāmarañena sokehi paridevehi dukkhehi domanassehi upāyāsehi dukkhotiṇṇo dukkhapareto app'eva nāma imassa kevalassa dukkhakkhandhassa antakiriya paññāyethā'ti.* - M.I.196,460; A.I.147.

² *Nay'idaṃ sukaram agāraṃ ajjhāvasatā ekantaparipuṇṇaṃ ekanta-parisuddhaṃ saṅkhalikhitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritum* - D.I.63; M.I.179,267,344.

³ *Socanti janā mamāyite na hi santi niccā pariggahā vinābhāvasantaṃ ev'idaṃ iti disvānāgāraṃ nāvase* - Sn.v.805.

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

*gharāvāso rajopatho abbhokāso pabbajjā.*¹ The Commentaries, which give further details of this, quote the Mahāaṭṭhakathā as saying that the household life does invariably give rise to defilement of the mind through greed etc.² This point of view, that the higher life of *brahmacariya* is closely bound up with renunciation, is so significant and is accepted in principle in Buddhism that in the biographies of the Buddha he is made to express it even at the stage of being a Bodhisatta, prior to his enlightenment.³ Those who choose that life leave their household behind with perfect ease. Inspired by this end which they have in view they find that nothing in their worldly possessions is too great to be sacrificed. Kāla, who fled from his wife and son, reassures us of this as he says: `Like the elephant that breaks its chains asunder the wise leave behind

¹ D.I.63; M.I.179, 267, 344.

² *Sambādho gharāvāso'ti sace'pi saṭṭhihatthe ghare yojanasatantare vā dve jayampatikā vasanti tathā'pi tesam sakiñcanapalibodhaṭṭhena gharāvāso sambādho ye'va. Rajopatho'ti rāgarajādīnaṃ uṭṭhānaṭṭhānan'ti Mahāaṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttam* - DA.I.180; SA.II.179; AA.III.187.

³ *Idha me aggivessana pubbe'va sambodhā anabhisambuddhassa bodhisattass'eva sato etadahosi. Sambādho gharāvāso..... agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajeyyan'ti* - M.I.240.

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

their sons, wealth and kinsmen and enter the life of *pabbajjā*.¹ The goal for which they strive becomes the constant and unflinching guiding force in their lives.

It is abundantly clear that early Buddhism with its spiritual earnestness considered *pabbajjā* or the life of renunciation as the ideal religious life.² The life of the monk is a stage beyond that of the laymen, and the passage from lay life to recluseship is always looked upon as an advance, a step forward in spiritual progress. Discarding all paraphernalia and associations of lay life a man should leave his home and take to the solitary life of a mendicant. In doing so he is compared to the Pāricchatta tree which sheds its leaves.³ The Cūladukkhakkhandha Sutta expresses the idea that the spiritual development enjoined in Buddhism would ultimately lead to *pabbajjā* or renunciation of

¹ *Jahanti putte sappaññā tato ñātī tato dhanam pabbajanti mahāvīrā nāgo chetvā'va bandhanam* - Thig.v.301.

² *Yassatthāya kulaputtā sammad'eva agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajanti tadanuttaram brahmacariyapariyosānam diṭṭh'eva dhamme sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharissathā'ti* - M.1.40, 172, 477.

³ *Ohārayitvā gihivyañjanāni sañchinnapatto yathā pāricchatto kāsāyavattho abhinikkhamitvā eko care khaggavisāṇakappo* - Sn.v.64.

household life. It is argued in the Sutta that if the basis from which thoughts of *lobha*, *dosa* and *moha* spring has been eliminated in any man, he would then no longer remain in the household or enjoy sensual pleasures.¹ Those who chose this way of life, inspite of the strict discipline and the endless striving it involved, decided that they would ceaselessly work all their life for the attainment of their goal. An independent observation by King Pasenadi Kosala in the Dhammacetiya Sutta testifies to this.² Those disciples would prefer death rather than give up their chosen career. A therī, despairing at the slow progress she made in her spiritual endeavours, declares that she would rather make an end of her life than return to lay life.³ The elder Sappadāsa who was placed in a similar situation voiced the same sentiment.⁴ This, in fact, became the accepted attitude to

¹ *So eva kho te mahānāma dhammo ajjhattaṃ appahīno yena te ekadā lobhadhammā'pi cittaṃ pariyādāya tiṭṭhanti dosadhammā'pi. cittaṃ pariyādāya tiṭṭhanti mohadhammā'pi cittaṃ pariyādāya tiṭṭhanti. So ca hi te mahānāma dhammo ajjhattaṃ pahīno abhavissa na tvaṃ agāraṃ ajjhāvaseyyāsi na kāme paribhuñjeyyāsi* - M.I.91

² *Idha panā'haṃ bhante bhikkhū passāmi yāvajīvaṃ āpāṇakoṭikaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ carante* - M.II.120.

³ *araṃ me idha ubbandhaṃ yañ'ca hīnaṃ punā'care* - Thig.v.80.

⁴ *Satthaṃ vā āharissāmi ko attho jīvitena me kathaṃ hi sikkhaṃ paccakkaṃ kālaṃ kubbetha mādiso* - Thag.v.407.

fickleness of faith among those leading the higher life. It is suicide, declares the Saṃyutta, to give up the higher religious life and revert to the lower order.¹

Thus early Buddhism, very naturally, seems to have exalted the life of the monk over that of the layman. In the spiritual quest, the monk is ahead of the layman on account of his very natural advantages with which the layman could not compete. The Suttanipāṭa illustrates this position beautifully where it says that the crested peacock adorned with its blue neck never equals the swan in its speed.² A monk does transcend a layman in that he gives up not only the belongings. but also the desires and emotions which are characteristic of those living in the household.³ He leads such a light livelihood, with just enough food for his sustenance and a garment to cover himself, that it

¹ *Maraṇam h'etaṃ bhikkhave ariyassa vinaye yo sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāyāvattati* - S.II.271.

² *Sikhī yathā nilagīvo vihaṅgamo haṃsassa nopeti jvaṃ kudācanaṃ evaṃ gihī nānukaroti bhikkhuno munino vivittassa vanamhi jhāyato* - Sn.v.221.

³ *Tatrā'pi tvam phagguna ye gehasitā chandā ye gehasitā vitakkā te pajaheyyāsi* - M.I.123.

is said that the monk goes about like a bird which, wherever it goes, carries only the weight of its feathers.¹

These world-renouncing and abstemious disciples of the Buddha seem to have had a mixed reception in the contemporary Indian society. Although celibacy and renunciation were nothing strange to Indian religions, yet the popularity of the new creed of the Buddha and the success of his early conversions appear to have roused some animated comments from his contemporaries. The ideal of renunciation in the new religion, they argued, led to social disintegration and breach of family life. It was added that women were widowed on account of this new movement and parents were robbed of their children.² This presumably would have been the most natural and at the same time the most superficial charge that could have been made against the Buddhist Order of monks. The Indians of the Buddha's day seem to have been accustomed to

¹ *Seyyathāpi nāma pakkhī sakuṇo yena yen'eva ḍeti sapattabhāro'va ḍeti evam'eva bhikkhu santuṭṭho hoti kāyaparihārikena cīvarena kucchiparihārikena piṇḍapātena yena yen'eva pakkamati samādāy'eva pakkamati* - M.I.180, 268

² *Manussā ujjhāyanti khīyanti vipācenti aputtakatāya paṭipanno samaṇo gotamo vedhavyāya paṭipanno samaṇo gotamo kulūpacchedāya paṭipanno samaṇo gotamo* - Vin.I.43.

look upon renunciation and religious mendicancy as a stage in man's life which is to be initiated at the appearance of grey hairs. Renunciation marks the quest for celestial pleasures on which one embarks only after the enjoyment of the pleasures of the world. This is well attested in the words of King Makhādeva in the Makhādeva Sutta where he says that since grey hairs have appeared on his head it is time for him to search for heavenly pleasures.¹ In the Raṭṭhapāla Sutta we get another expression of this idea where King Koravya tells the elder Raṭṭhapāla that people leave the household life and take to religious mendicancy only when they fail to make a success of this life on account of old age or disease, loss of wealth or kith and kin.²

It would also not be out of place here to observe that the hallmark of Indian religious mendicancy at the time was

¹ *Pātubhūtā kho me tāta kumāra devadūtā dissanti sirasmiṃ phalitāni jātāni. Bhuttā kho pana me mānusakā kāmā. Samayo dibbe kāme pariyesitum* - M.II.75.

² *Cattār'imāni bho raṭṭhapāla pārījuññāni yehi pārījuññehi samannāgatā idh'ekacce kesamassum ohāretvā kāsāyāni vatthāni acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajanti. Katamāni cattāri. Jarāpārījuññāṃ vyādhipārījuññāṃ bhogapārījuññāṃ ñātipārījuññāṃ* - M.I.66.

asceticism which more often than not turned out to be of a severe order. Both popular taste and contemporary practices mutually contributed towards this position. Putting forward his new charter for more rigorous monastic living, Devadatta pointed out that people adore severe self-abnegation.¹ The naked ascetics of the day argued with the Buddha that no happiness could be attained except through the path of pain.² It was also observed earlier that the *caturaṅga-samannāgata-brahmacariya* which is of non-Buddhist origin consisted of austerities of the highest severity.³ The Buddha denounced this as a form of religious life and said, in his first sermon, that it was a mean and vulgar way of life which was painful. Therefore it was to be ruled out as a disastrous extreme which should be avoided.⁴ It was not the way whereby the mind would triumph over the body and attain to higher states of enlightenment.⁵ Nor

¹ *Lūkhappasannā hi āvuso manussā* - Vin.III.171.

² *Na kho āvuso gotama sukkena sukhaṃ adhigantabbaṃ dukkhena kho sukhaṃ adhigantabbaṃ* - M.I.93.

³ *Supra* p.26.

⁴ *...yo cā'yaṃ attakilamathānuyogo dukkho anatthasamhito* - Vin.I.10.

⁵ *Na kho panā'haṃ imāya kaṭukāya dukkarakārikāya adhigacchāmi uttariṃ manussadhammā alamariyaññadassanavisesaṃ. Siyā nu kho añño maggo bodhāyā'ti* - M.I.246.

did this mode of conduct help to pay off the sins of the past as was maintained by the Jains.¹ Thus the Buddha never set the mind and the body against each other. One should take special note here of the statement in the Padhāna Sutta which appears, as it were, to contradict this position.² In reply to Māra, the Bodhisatta is reported to have said the following.' While my flesh wastes away my mind will reach greater tranquility': *Maṃsesu khīyamānesu bhīyyo cittaṃ pasīdati* - Sn.v.434. This does not, however, seem to mean that the way to the tranquility of mind is through this physical decline. As the Commentary appears to indicate these words are in reply to Māra who exaggerated the Bodhisatta's physical deterioration with a view to luring him into the enjoyment of sensual pleasures.³ The Bodhisatta was fully aware that the way to the attainment of the desired goal was undeniably a hard one which would make very heavy demands.⁴ But with a sincerity of purpose and an unrivalled earnestness which are coupled with a perfect

¹ *So evam āha atthi vo nigaṇṭhā pubbe pāpaṃ kammaṃ kataṃ. Taṃ imāya kaṭukāya dukkarakārikāya nijjaretha* - Ibid.93.

² Sn.vv.433, 434.

³ SnA.II.389.

⁴ *Nadīnaṃ api sotāni ayaṃ vāto visosaye kiñ ca me pahitattassa lohitaṃ nūpasussaye* - Sn.v.433.

judgement, he was not to be dissuaded from his venture.¹ It is in spite of the threatened danger to his physical self that he is certain of attaining the desired mental equipoise. Thus what the Bodhisatta wished to establish was that his indomitable spirit would not give way under the decline of the flesh: *Na tv'eva tappaccayā saṃsīdati* - SnA.II.389.

It is in fact a healthy and peaceful interdependence of the mind and the body that is aimed at in the religious life which the Buddha prescribed. While the body is distressed no control or concentration of the mind could ever be achieved. Keeping this in mind the Buddha decried not only the baser forms of austerities which weary the body but also excessive striving, even though such striving may be channelled in the right direction.² The composure of the body and the consequent sense of ease was vital for the acquisition of any tranquility of the mind. (*Pamuditassa pīti jāyati pītimanassa kāyo passambhati passaddhakāyo sukhaṃ vedeti sukhino cittaṃ samādhīyati* - M.I.37).

¹ *Atthi saddhā tato viriyaṃ paññā ca mama vijjati evaṃ maṃ pahitattam'pi kiṃ jīvaṃ anupucchasi* - Sn.v.432.

² *Api ca kho me aticiram anuvitakkayato anuvicārayato kāyo kilameyya kāye kilante cittaṃ ūhaññeyya ūhate citte ārā cittaṃ samādhimhā'ti* - M.I.116.

Coloured by this new attitude to mind culture, the code of conduct governing the life of the Buddhist disciple became considerably different from those of the contemporary groups. The life of the Buddhist disciple was never degraded to sub-human levels as are described at length in the Buddhist Suttas which deal with the austerities of the day.¹ Clean and healthy living, both in mind and body, was their rule. The Buddha saw no reason to retreat from physical and mental well-being, as long as it was not mingled with and contaminated by sensual pleasures. In fact, he recognised the physical well-being as a basis for the other.² A high value was set on physical fitness and freedom from disease, not so much for its own sake but as forming a solid basis for mental development. It is partly with this end in view that the Buddha regulated the lives of the monks with regard to their habits of food and drink.³ Regularity

¹ M.I.77f., 92. Also see A.I.240f. under *cīvarapaviveka*, *piṇḍapātāpaviveka* and *senāsanapaviveka*.

² *Na kho ahaṃ tassa sukhassa bhāyāmi yaṃ taṃ sukhaṃ aññatr'eva kāmehi aññatra akusalehi dhammehī'ti. Tassa mayhaṃ aggivessana etadahosi. Na kho taṃ sukaraṃ sukhaṃ adhigantuṃ evaṃ adhimattakasimānaṃ pattakāyena. Yannūnā'haṃ oḷārikaṃ āhāraṃ āhāreyyaṃ odanakummāsan'ti* - M.I.247.

³ *Etha tumhe'pi bhikkhave ekāsanabhojanaṃ bhuñjatha. Ekāsanabhojanaṃ kho bhikkhave tumhe'pi bhuñjamānā*

and moderation in eating, the Buddha maintained, contributes to a healthy life, but lack of food would impair the successful progress of *brahmacariya*. Food is therefore to be taken with a view to eliminating physical distress so that the endeavour for spiritual development may be made unhindered.¹ Thus the Buddhist monks did eat and dress much less than the laymen and on a much simpler pattern. The Buddha constantly reminded them that once they renounced the household life they should never again lean towards the ways of the laymen. *Seyyathā'pi gihī kāmabhogino* was a grim reminder to every erring individual. Every monk who was sufficiently alert in mind always reminded himself that it was unworthy of his ideal to incline towards the enjoyment of pleasures which he had renounced on leaving the household.² The monk who is satisfied with his four basic sustenances (*cattāro nissayā*) which consist of begged food and patch-work robes, way-side shelters

appābādhatañ ca sañjānissatha appātānkatañ ca lahuṭṭhānañ ca balañ ca phāsuvihārañ cā'ti - M.I.124

¹ *Ehi tvaṃ bhikkhu bhojane mattaññu hohi paṭisaṅkhā yoniso āhāraṃ āhāreyyāsi n'eva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya yāvad'eva imassa kāyassa ṭhitiyā yāpanāya vihimsūparatiyā brahmacariyānuggahāya* - M.III.2. See also M.I.10, 273, 355; II.138.

² A.I.147f.

and the simplest of medicaments, is described as a triumphant free man who finds himself at home everywhere.¹ Even these minimum requirements, a monk should use with extreme frugality and diligent consideration.²

The marked contrast of the Buddhist monks when viewed in relation to contemporary religious mendicants, and the liberal patronage they enjoyed brought upon them a series of accusations that they were leading a life of ease and luxury.³ But these statements were often groundless and based on misconceptions. It is proved by the fact that those who sought admission to the Buddhist Order, lured by these assumed attractions, were soon disillusioned and discovered to their utter dismay the demands of Buddhist monastic discipline. There is also no doubt that some would have found themselves in the same position as the Brahmin who joined the Order to make an easy living on the gifts of food offered by the laymen and subsequently threatened to revert to lay life on being called

¹ *Uttitt̥thapiṇḍo āhāro pūtimuttañ ca bhesajam senāsanaṃ rukkhamūlaṃ paṃsukūlañ ca cīvaram yass'ete abhisambhutvā sa ve cātuddiso naro* - Thag. v. 1059.

² M.I.10, 158; Vin.I.58 Also *infra* pp.175ff.

³ *Ime kho samaṇā sakyaputtiyā sukhasīlā sukhasamācārā subhojanāni bhuñjitvā nivātesu sayanesu sayanti* - Vin.I.77f.

Chapter III - The Early Buddhist Ideal of the Monk

upon to go begging for alms.¹ There was also the other section of the community who truly recognised the sincerity of the Buddhist disciples and their devotion to the holy life.² They were looked upon as a perfect model of good living and were of such exemplary character that men who wished to join their ranks were not wanting in the society of the day.³

¹ *Nā'ham āvuso etaṃkāraṇā pabbajito piṇḍāya carissāmī'ti. Sace me dassatha bhuñjissāmi no ce me dassatha vibbhamissāmī'ti* - Vin.I.57f.

² *Ime kho samaṇā sakyaputtiyā dhammacārino samacārino brahmacārino saccavādino sīlavanto kalyāṇadhammā* - Vin.I.73.

³ *Sace kho mayaṃ samaṇesu sakyaputtiyesu pabbajeyyāma evaṃ mayam pāpā ca virameyyāma kalyāṇaṃ ca kareyyāmā'ti* - Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

The Foundations of Monastic Life:

Sīla, Sikkhā and Sikkhāpada

The complete spiritual development of the early Buddhist disciple who has voluntarily embarked on the life of *brahmacariya* seems to have been covered under the term *sikkhā* which means culture, training, discipline and also study. All the rewards of monastic life including the final goal of Arahantship are therefore the result of *sikkhā* (*Tassa evaṃ jānato evaṃ passato kāmāsavā'pi cittaṃ vimuccati... nāparaṃ itthattāyā'ti pajānāti. Taṃ kissa hetu. Evaṃ hi etaṃ bhaddāli hoti yathā taṃ satthusāsane sikkhāya paripūrakārissā'ti - M.I.442.*) Similarly the respect in which *sikkhā* is held by the disciples (*sikkhā-gāravatā*) is considered a cardinal virtue of Buddhist monasticism (*ye pana te kulaputtā saddhā agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajitā... sikkhāya tibbagāravā - M.I.32*). It is also one of six virtues which contribute to a disciple's spiritual stability.¹ It is listed together with the respect for the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha (*satthugāravatā, dhammagāravatā and saṅghagāravatā*) and two other virtues which vary in different

¹ A.III.330.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

contexts.¹ Consequently the abandonment of the monastic discipline and the return to lay life was regarded as the negation of *sikkhā* (*ye pi samaṇassa gotamassa sāvakā sabrahmacārīhi sampayojetvā sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāya āvattanti* - M. II. 5).

This concept of *sikkhā* which brings within its fold the entire system of spiritual development in Buddhism is considered as being threefold in character. According to this classification the training of the disciple is divided into three successive stages of 1. *sīla*, 2. *samādhi* and 3. *paññā* and goes under the name of *tisso sikkhā* (*Tisso imā bhikkhave sikkhā. Katamā tisso. Adhisīlasikkhā adhicittasikkhā adhipaññāsikkhā* - A.I.235.). It is reported in the Aṅguttara Nikāya that once a Vajjiputtaka monk who confessed his inability to abide by such a large number of rules which exceeded one hundred and fifty in number (*sādhikaṃ diyaḍḍhasikkhāpadasataṃ*) and which were recited fortnightly at the Pātimokkha ceremony was told by the Buddha that it would serve the purpose of his monastic life if he could discipline himself in terms of the threefold *sikkhā*.² All those rules, it is said, are contained within the threefold *sikkhā* (*Imā kho bhikkhave tisso sikkhā yatth'etaṃ sabbaṃ samodhānaṃ*

¹ A.III.330. *Appamādagāravatā* and *paṭisanthāragāravatā* 331.

Hirigāravatā and *otappagāravatā* 423. *Sovacassatā* and *kalyānamittatā*

² A.I.230 f.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

gacchati - A.I.231). These three items of discipline are also referred to as constituting the duties of monastic life (*Tīṇi' māni bhikkhave samaṇassa samaṇakaraṇīyāni. Katamāni tīṇi. Adhisīlasikkhā-samādānaṃ adhicittasikkhā-samādānaṃ adhipaññāsikkhā-samādānaṃ* - A.I.229.) They bring about the accomplishments of a recluse which make him a true *samaṇa*. Buddhaghosa too, quoting the Aṅguttara Nikāya verbatim in his commentary on the Mahāassapura Sutta, reaffirms this view.¹ These three stages of *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā*, together mark the complete development of Buddhist monastic life which leads to the acquisition of true knowledge or *aññā* (*Seyyathā pi sārīputta bhikkhu sīla-sampanno samādhi-sampanno paññā-sampanno diṭṭheva dhamme aññaṃ ārādheyya* - M.I.71). Viewed negatively, it is said that self-training in terms of these three results in the elimination of lust, hatred and delusion (*tasmā tuyhaṃ bhikkhu adhisīlam'pi sikkhato adhicittam'pi sikkhato adhipañnam'pi sikkhato rāgo pahīyissati doso pahīyissati moho pahīyissati* - A.I.230). Thus the true endeavour to develop all these aspects is made the basis of all monastic aspirations. The Ākaṅkheyya Sutta gives it as a prescription for the perfection of monastic life. It is held out as the best code for the attainment of the highest good in religious life, including Arahantship. (*Ākaṅkheyya ce bhikkhave bhikkhu āsavānaṃ*

¹ MA.II.313.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

khayā anāsavaṃ cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ diṭṭhe'va dhamme sayamaṃ abhiññāya sacchikatvā upasampajja vihareyyan'ti sīlesv'eva'ssa paripūrakārī ajjhattaṃ cetosamathaṃ anuyutto anirākatajjhāno vipassanāya samannāgato brūhetā suññāgārānaṃ - M.I.35f.). Buddhaghosa establishes that the procedure described here is identical with the discipline of the *tisso sikkhā*.¹

Nevertheless, it is clear from the evidence of the Suttas that out of the threefold *sikkhā* special emphasis was laid on *sīla* as the foundation of all spiritual attainments. The Buddha himself is seen assuring his disciples of the efficacy of *sīla* as the basis of spiritual progress (*yato kho tvaṃ bhikkhu sīlaṃ nissāya sīle patiṭṭhāya ime cattāro satipaṭṭhāne bhāvēssasi tato tuyhaṃ bhikkhu yā ratti vā divaso vā āgamissati vuddhi yeva pāṭikañkhā kusalesu dhammesu no parihānīti - S.V.187.*). Once the monastic life is well established on the *sīla* basis all else seem to follow in natural succession. The Ākañkheyya Sutta, in fact, begins with the Buddha's admonition to the monks to be mindful of their *sīla* and to acquire thereby the necessary discipline (*sampannasīlā bhikkhave viharatha sampannapātimokkhā pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvutā viharatha ācāragocara-sampannā anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī*

¹ MA.I.157.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

samādāya sikkhatha sikkhāpadesu - M.I.33). The Sāmaññaphala Sutta gives a complete account of what ought to be and what probably was the proper conduct of the good monk (*Evaṃ pabbajito samāno pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu kāyakammavacīkammena samannāgato kusalena parisuddhājīvo sīlasampanno indriyesu guttadvāro satisampajaññaena samannāgato santuṭṭho* - D.I.63.) An analysis and evaluation of the aspects of monastic conduct which are described here will be found in a succeeding chapter.¹ For the present we shall only quote Professor Rhys Davids who in his study of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta makes the following observations regarding its distinctly Buddhist flavour in its reference to monastic conduct: `Now it is perfectly true that of these thirteen consecutive propositions or groups of propositions, it is only the last, No. 13 which is exclusively Buddhist. But the things omitted, the union of the whole of those included into one system, the order in which the ideas are arranged, the way in which they are treated as so many steps of a ladder whose chief value depends on the fact that it leads up to the culminating point of Nirvāna in Arahatsip - all this is also distinctly Buddhist.'²

¹ See Chapter V.

² *Dialogues of the Buddha* I [SBB.II.], p.59.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

Getting down to the details of the above passage, however, the Sutta proceeds with an exhaustive analysis of *sīlasampanno* which is followed in succession by *indriyesu guttadvāro*, *satisampajaññaena samannāgato* and *santuṭṭho*. When we compare the comments of Buddhaghosa on the above passage¹ and the definition of *sīlasampanno* given in the Sekha Sutta² it becomes clear to us that here too the first consideration has been the perfection in *sīla*. This prestige which *sīla* enjoys in early Buddhism as the basic training in religious life has never been challenged in the centuries that followed in the history of Pali Buddhism. In the Milindapañha (*circa* first century B.C.) the venerable Nāgasena reiterates its impotence with equal vigour (*Paṭiṭṭhānalakkhaṇaṃ mahārāja sīlaṃ sabbesaṃ kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ indriya - bala - bojjaṅga - magga - satipaṭṭhāna - sammappadhāna - iddhipāda - jhāna - vimokkha - samādhī - samāpattīnaṃ sīlaṃ paṭiṭṭham. Sīle paṭiṭṭhassa kho mahārāja sabbe kusalā dhammā na parihāyanti* - Milin.34). In the fifth century A.C. Buddhaghosa is equally eloquent on it in the Visuddhimagga.³ Both Nāgasena and Buddhaghosa quote Canonical texts regarding the basic value of *sīla*. The Saṃyutta Nikāya records

¹ DA.I.182.

² M.I.355.

³ Vism.I.1.ff.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

in two places the following statement which is ascribed to the Buddha:

*Sīle patiṭṭhāya naro sapañño cittaṃ paññañ ca
bhāvayaṃ
ātāpī nipako bhikkhu so imaṃ vijaṭaye jaṭaṃ.*¹

This stanza which emphasises the importance of *sīla* is quoted by Nāgasena as an utterance of the Buddha (*Bhāsitaṃ pi etaṃ mahārāja bhagavatā sīle patiṭṭhāya...* Miln.34). Buddhaghosa does the same in the Visuddhimagga. (*Ten'āha bhagavā sīle patiṭṭhāya ...* Vism.I. 4) In the Gaṇakamoggllāna² and the Dantabhūmi³ Suttas of the Majjhima Nikāya, which deal with the development of the monastic life under the guidance of the Master himself, the main emphasis is on the idea that the spiritual development of the monk is a gradual process and is undertaken in successive stages (*anupubbāsikkhā anupubbakiriyaṃ anupubba-paṭipadā*). The first words which the Buddha addresses to his disciples on taking them under his direction are with regard to their perfection in *sīla* and the consequent restraint which is associated with it (*Ehi tvaṃ bhikkhu sīlavā hohi pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharāhi*

¹ S.I.13, 165.

² M.III.2.

³ M.III.134.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhāhi sikkhāpadesū'ti - M.III.2,134).

The perfection in *sīla*, no doubt, marks the first stage in the spiritual development of the Buddhist disciple and this advice of the Buddha to his disciples is found scattered in many places in the Sutta Piṭaka, sometimes addressed to single individuals and sometimes to the Saṅgha as a whole. It is thus clear that *sīla* was the corner-stone of early Buddhist monasticism. First and foremost, the Buddhist disciple had to be *sīlavā*. It meant that the disciple had to regulate his life in terms of what is recorded under *sīla* as conditions of good monastic living, abstaining from what is indicated as unworthy and contradictory to his spiritual aspirations. In the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, the term *sīlasampanno* is used as equivalent in meaning to *sīlavā* and under it are included forty-three items of *sīla* which are subdivided into three groups as Minor [26], Middle [10] and Major [7] - (*cūlasīla*, *majjhimasīla* and *mahāsīla*).¹ A number of Suttas of the Majjhima Nikāya,² in describing the *sīla* of the Buddhist disciple, include under the category of *sīla* (*sīlakkhandha*) only the first twenty-six items which in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta are all grouped under *cūlasīla*. They include the three bodily and the

¹ D.I.63-69. Milindapañha too, recognises this threefold division. Miln. 399.

² M.I.179f, 345f.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

four verbal misdeeds or *akusalakamma* and have in addition certain practices, like the acceptance of gold and silver, cattle and land, which are unworthy of a monk but are allowable in the case of laymen. There are also some others like the last three items of the *cūlasīla* which include fraudulent practices, violence and atrocities which are neither good for the monk nor for the layman.¹ Almost all the ten items under the *majjhimasīla* are only further elaborations of some of the items of the *cūlasīla*. The seven items of the *mahāsīla* are only detailed descriptions of the different forms of ignoble livelihood or *micchā ājīva* which are improper for a monk.

These items of *sīla*, in the Suttas where they occur, do not bear the impress of an order or injunction. The disciples of the Buddha are described as giving up *akusalakamma* through word and deed. Abstaining from these evils, the disciples develop their corresponding virtues (*Idha mahārāja bhikkhu pāṇātipātamaṃ pahāya pāṇātipātā paṭivirato hoti nihitandaṇḍo nihitasattho lajjī dayāpanno sabba-pāṇa-bhūta-hitānukampī viharati* - D.I.63ff.). They also abstain from patterns of conduct which are deemed unworthy of a monk. This freedom and the absence of pressure in the regulation of the spiritual life which

¹ D.I.64 a. *tulākūṭa-kaṃsakūṭa-mānakūṭa*. b. *ukkoṭaṇa-vañcana-nikatisāciyoga*

c. *chedana-vadhabandhana-viparāmosa-ālopasahasākāra*.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

underlies the letter and the spirit of *sīla* is very characteristic of Buddhist monasticism in its earliest phase. With those sincere and earnest disciples of the Buddha who gathered themselves around him at the inception of the *Sāsana*, no injunctions or restrictive regulations seem to have been necessary. In the *Kakacūpama Sutta*, the Buddha records his memory of the early days of the *Sāsana* when he needed no strict orders to determine the behaviour of his disciples. At a mere suggestion by the Master the disciples took to the good ways of life recommended as they did when they adopted the habit of one meal a day (*Ārādhayiṃsu vata me bhikkhave bhikkhū ekaṃ samayaṃ cittaṃ. Idhā'haṃ bhikkhave bhikkhū āmantesiṃ. Ahaṃ kho bhikkhave ekāsanabhojanam bhujjāmi ... Etha tumhe'pi bhikkhave ekāsanabhojanam bhujjatha ... Na me bhikkhave tesu bhikkhusu anusāsanī karaṇīyā ahoṣi sat'uppādakaraṇīyaṃ eva me bhikkhave tesu bhikkhusu ahoṣi - M.I.124*).

The incident referred to in the *Kakacūpama Sutta* clearly indicates the manner in which the Buddha's early disciples received and accepted his recommendations regarding the way of life appropriate for the monk. The Buddha seems at first to have counted on the sincerity and spiritual earnestness of his early disciples for the success of his religious order. It was his wish, no doubt, to manage with the minimum of restrictive

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

regulations. But in the growing monastic community whose numbers were rapidly increasing, laxity in discipline was bound to appear before long. The Bhaddāli Sutta indicates a recognition of the relative strength of the Saṅgha at two different periods within one's memory (*Appakā kho tumhe bhaddāli tena samayena ahuvattha yadā vo ahaṃ ājānīyasusūpamaṃ dhammapariyāyaṃ desesiṃ. Sarasi tvaṃ bhaddālīti* - M.1.445). The strength in numbers, the popularity of individuals or groups and the maturity of the members of the Saṅgha as it was becoming a long established institution, were among the causes of corruption.¹ The Bhaddāli Sutta² shows us how the once accepted monastic tradition of one meal a day which is recorded in the Kakacūpama Sutta and which had also found for itself a place among the items of *sīla* as a condition of good monastic living³ had to be reinforced with a restrictive regulation making it an offence to eat out of regular hours.⁴ These regulations which are called *sikkhāpada* now provide, beside *sīla*, an effective instrument for the furtherance of good discipline in the monastic community.

¹ M.I.445.

² M.I.437.

³ D.I.64.

⁴ Vin.IV.85: Pāc.37.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

It is also probable that the Buddha has such rebellious disciples like Bhaddāli in mind when he speaks in the Kakacūpama Sutta of the willing acceptance of the one meal a day recommendation by his disciples as a thing of the past. In spite of the general agreement that abstinence from irregularity of meals was wholesome for the monastic life, yet certain laxities regarding this practice are noticeable in the early Buddhist monastic community. The incident which brought about the promulgation of Pācittiya 37 is such an instance.¹ It was certainly an offence against *sīla*, but since *sīla* had no legal status the offender could not be prosecuted and punished under its authority. It is such situations as these which mark the introduction of *sikkhāpada* into the sphere of Buddhist monastic discipline. Thus, in the Buddhist Vinaya, the first offender who provokes the promulgation of a *sikkhāpada* is declared free, in a legal sense, from guilt (*anāpatti ... ādikammikassa* - Vin.III.33. etc.). His offence, at the time, is against an item of *sīla* and he could not therefore be legally prosecuted for a pre-*sikkhāpada* offence. This role of the Vinaya, that it serves as an instrument of prosecution, is clearly indicated in the text of the Vinaya itself.² In the introduction to Pācittiya 72, we discover the fear expressed by the Chabbaggiya monks that if many monks are

¹ Ibid.

² Vin.IV.143.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

conversant with the text of the Vinaya that they are liable to be accused and questioned by those Masters of the Vinaya with regard to laxities in discipline (*Sace ime vinaye pakataññuno bhavissanti amhe yen'icchakaṃ yad'icchakaṃ yāvad'icchakaṃ ākaḍḍhissanti parikaḍḍhissanti. Handa mayaṃ āvuso vinayaṃ vivaṇṇemā'ti* - Vin.IV.143). Buddhaghosa too, explains the role of *sikkhāpada* on the same lines when he says that in the presence of *sikkhāpada* the Saṅgha could make specific references to the body of rules and make just and legally valid accusations.¹

A careful analysis of the history of Pārājika I reveals the manner in which the authoritative disciplinary machinery of the Vinaya came to be set up in gradual stages. The Suttavibhaṅga records that Sudinna committed the offence of *methunadhamma* (sexual intercourse) at a time when the *sikkhāpada* on this point had not been promulgated. It is said that he did not know the consequences it involved (... *apaññatte sikkhāpade anādīnavadasso* - Vin.III.18.). It is difficult to maintain here that *anādīnavadasso* means that Sudinna did not know that his act was an offence against the spirit of Buddhist monasticism. Two things preclude us from accepting this position. Some time after the commission of the act Sudinna is

¹ VinA.I.224.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

stricken with remorse that he had not been able to live to perfection his monastic life (*atha kho āyasmato sudinnassa ahu'd eva kukkuccam ahu vippaṭisāro alābhā vata me na vata me lābhā dulladdhaṃ vata me na vata me suladdhaṃ yāvā'haṃ evaṃ svākkhāte dhammavinaye pabbajitvā nāsakkhiṃ yāvajīvaṃ paripunṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritun'ti* - Vin. III.19) He knows and feels that he has erred and brought ruin upon himself. For he says that he has committed a sinful deed (*Atthi me pāpaṃ kammaṃ kataṃ* - Vin.III.19). Perhaps it would also have occurred to him that his act was in violation of the item of *sīla* which refers to the practice of celibacy (*Abrahmacariyaṃ pahāya brahmacārī hoti ārācārī virato methunā gāmadhammā* - D.I.63).

Therefore we cannot take *anādīnavadasso* to mean that Sudinna did not know that *methunadhamma* was an offence against monastic life. Nor does he claim such ignorance anywhere during the inquiries held by his fellow celibates or the Buddha. Secondly, even in the absence of any restrictive regulations it seems to have been very clear to all members of the Buddhist Saṅgha that according to what the Buddha had declared in his Dhamma, the offence of *methunadhamma* contradicts the spirit of true renunciation (*Nanu āvuso bhagavatā aneka-pariyāyena virāgāya dhammo desito no sarāgāya visamyogāya dhammo desito no samyogāya*

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

anupādānāya dhammo desīto no saupādānāya - Vin.III.19). Similarly, the Buddha had repeatedly stated to the monks that gratification of sense desires was in no way permissible. Both the disciples and the Buddha remind Sudinna of this position (*Nanu āvuso bhagavatā anekapariyāyena kāmānaṃ pahānaṃ akkhātāṃ kāmasaññānaṃ pariññā akkhātā kāmapiṇḍānaṃ paṭivīnayo akkhāto kāmavitakkānaṃ samugghāto akkhāto kāmapiṇḍānaṃ vūpasamo akkhāto* - Vin. III. 2). On the other hand, the *sikkhāpada* on *methunadhamma*, i.e. Pārājika I, which came to be laid down subsequently does no more than determine the gravity of the offence and the consequent punishment it involves. Therefore what the statement *anādīnavadasso* here means probably is that abstinence from *methunadhamma* being one among the many items of *sīla*, Sudinna did not fully apprehend the relative seriousness of his offence.

However, this passage receives a very different interpretation in the hands of Buddhaghosa. The commentator says that Sudinna committed the act of *methunadhamma* thinking that it was not wrong because he did not realise the consequences which the Buddha was going to indicate while laying down this *sikkhāpada*.¹ It is abundantly clear that

¹ VinA.I.213.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

Sudinna did not know that he would have been expelled from the Order for his offence had he not been the first to be guilty of it, because this penalty came to be categorically stated only in the *sikkhāpada* which was laid down after the commission of the offence by Sudinna. But we are unable to agree with Buddhaghosa when he says that Sudinna did not know that he was doing something wrong and thought he was completely blameless (*anavajjasaññī* and *niddosasaññī*). This interpretation does not seem to be possible unless we say that Sudinna was completely ignorant of the Dhamma or we take the words *vajja* and *dosa* here in an unnecessarily restricted legal sense. This is obviously what Buddhaghosa does in his explanation of *anavajjasaññī* and *niddosasaññī* (*Anādīnavadasso'ti yaṃ bhagavā idāni sikkhāpadaṃ paññāpento ādīnavam dasseti tam apassanto anavajjasaññī hutvā... ettha pana ādīnavam apassanto niddosasaññī ahosi. Tena vuttam anādīnavadasso'ti* - VinA.I.213). But it is the criteria of the Dhamma which both Sudinna's fellow-celibates and the Buddha adopt in chastising him. Does not Sudinna himself admit that he has incurred a guilt (*Atthi me pāpaṃ kammaṃ kataṃ purāṇadutiyikāya methuno dhammo paṭisevito* - Vin.III.19), and that therefore his monastic life has been a failure (...*yāvā' haṃ evaṃ svākkhāte dhammavinaye pabbajitvā nāsakkhiṃ yāvajīvaṃ paripuṇṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritun' ti* - Ibid.)? Thus, this

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

ignorance of the possible penalty cannot be taken as rendering the offender blameless.

It is possible to state at this stage that the *sikkhāpada* of the Vinaya Piṭaka have been evolved as instruments of prosecution with a monastic legal validity, against offences which in the general text of the Dhamma are put down as improper and unworthy of a monk, which sometimes are also applicable to laymen, or as being detrimental to the spiritual progress of the monk. It is this particular character of the *sikkhāpada* of which the greater part of the Vinaya consists, which made the Vinaya so obnoxious to quite a number of rebellious monks even during the lifetime of the Master (*Sace ime vinaye pakataññuno bhavissanti amhe yen' icchakaṃ yad' icchakaṃ yāvad' icchakaṃ ākaḍḍhissanti parikaḍḍhissanti. Handa mayaṃ āvuso vinayaṃ vivaṇṇemā' ti* - Vin.IV.134.). The need for such legalised administration of the Saṅgha arose only with the lapse of time. It was already referred to above how the Buddha recollects with pleasure the golden age of the Buddhist Saṅgha when the good life according to the Master's bidding was practised at a mere suggestion.¹ According to a tradition preserved in the Samantapāsādikā,² this sense of responsibility and earnestness among the members of the Saṅgha lasted

¹ *Supra* p.45 f.

² VinA.I.213.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

only twenty years. For twenty years from the enlightenment of the Buddha, says the tradition, no serious offence like a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa was ever witnessed, and hence there was no provocation for the promulgation of Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa rules. Then there began to appear the need for legislation. In course of time laxities in discipline and lawlessness among the members of the monastic community signalled to the Buddha that the time had come to lay down restrictive regulations for the guidance of its members (*Yato ca kho bhaddāli idh' ekacce āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā saṅghe pātubhavanti atha satthā sāvakaṇaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ paññāpeti tesam y'eva āsavaṭṭhāniyānaṃ dhammānaṃ paṭighātāya* - M.I.445.).

In the Bhaddāli Sutta, the above quoted words of the Buddha to Bhaddāli that he lays down rules and regulations only as the need arises¹ seem to come at a time when already a fair number of regulations had been laid down. This fact appears to be recognised in the words of Bhaddāli as he questions the Buddha with regard to the increase in the number of *sikkhāpada* (*Ko pana bhante hetu ko paccayo yen'etarahi bahutarāni c'eva sikkhāpadāni honti appatarā ca bhikkhū aññāya saṅṭhahanti* - M.I.445). The Buddha's reply to this is, in

¹ M.I.445.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

fact, in defence of the increase of regulations which is said to have been necessitated by the steady decline in morality (*Evaṃ hi etaṃ bhaddāli hoti sattesu hāyamānesu saddhamme antaradhāyamāne bahutarāni c'eva sikkhāpadāni honti appatarā ca bhikkhū aññāya saṅṭhahanti* - M.I.445). In the Saṃyutta Nikāya, the venerable Mahā Kassapa is seen making the same observation about the increase in the number of *sikkhāpada*.¹ On the other hand, the semi-historical introduction to the Suttavibhaṅga places these words of the Buddha regarding the promulgation of the rules in a different context.² Here the Buddha Gotama, at the request of the venerable Sāriputta, discusses the success and failure of the monastic organizations of the six previous Buddhas from Vipassi to Kassapa and analyses in detail the causes which contributed to these vicissitudes. In addition to the exhaustive preaching of the Dhamma, the adequate provision of restrictive regulations and the institution of the monastic ritual of the Pātimokkha are considered vital for the successful establishment of the monastic order.³ It is further recorded that the venerable

¹ S.II.224.

² Vin.III.9ff.

³ For a different type of Pātimokkha ritual which is said to have been adopted by the Buddhas of the past see Mahāpadāna Sutta. (D.II.48f.) and Ānandattherauposathapañhavatthu (DhpA. III.236f.).

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

Sāriputta, getting wiser by the experience of the Buddhas of the past, requests the Buddha Gotama to lay down *sikkhāpada* and institute the ritual of the Pātimokkha for the guidance of his disciples. The Buddha then silences Sāriputta saying that he himself knows the proper time for it, and repeats the rest of the argument as is recorded in the Bhaddāli Sutta that rules and regulations would be laid down only as the occasion demands. However, there are two noticeable differences in these two accounts. In the Bhaddāli Sutta, the Buddha tells Bhaddāli that he does not lay down *sikkhāpada* until they are really necessitated by circumstances and that with the appearance of signs of corruption in the Order he would lay down *sikkhāpada* for their arrest. In the Suttavibhaṅga, the institution of the ritual of the Pātimokkha is added to this as a further safeguard. The absence of this reference to the Pātimokkha in the Bhaddāli Sutta does not entitle us to argue that the account in the Bhaddāli Sutta is therefore anterior to the institution of the Pātimokkha ritual. It may be that since *sikkhāpada* and their gradual increase was the main concern of Bhaddāli, the Sutta speaks about the promulgation of *sikkhāpada* alone and leaves from it any reference to the Pātimokkha ritual.

The second point is far more interesting. The Bhaddāli Sutta has five items as causes of corruption in the monastic order. The list begins with *mahatta* (greatness) and adds *lābhagga*

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

(highest gain), *yasagga* (highest fame), *bāhusacca* (great learning) and *rattaññutā* (seniority). The Suttavibhaṅga has only four items which run as follows: *rattaññumahatta* (greatness of seniority), *vepullamahatta* (greatness of number), *lābhaggamahatta* (greatness of gain) and *bāhusaccamahatta* (greatness of learning). The first thing we notice here is that while *mahatta* was used in the Bhaddāli Sutta as a specific condition it is used in the Suttavibhaṅga as a general attribute. The *yasagga* of the former is also left out in the latter. In the Suttavibhaṅga list, *rattaññumahatta* which is the last item in the Bhaddāli Sutta takes precedence over all other considerations. Consequently, *mahatta* which headed the list in the Bhaddāli Sutta takes the second place in the Suttavibhaṅga under the new name of *vepullamahatta*. This change of position, and probably also of emphasis of *rattaññutā* is a significant one. For this attribute of *rattaññutā*, both in relation to the monastic community as well as to individual monks seems to imply their existence over a long period of time. Probably at the time of the Bhaddāli Sutta, *rattaññutā* as cause of corruption of the monastic community was only beginning to gather momentum. It was to become a potent factor only in the years to come. Hence it would not have been in proper sequence if *rattaññutā* as a cause of corruption headed the list in the Bhaddāli Sutta. It is therefore rightly relegated to the last place. On the other hand, the increase in the number of monks was then a reality

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

and was no doubt a constant cause of trouble. The Buddha's remarks to Bhaddāli imply that the numbers in the monastic community at that time were not as few as they used to be (*appakā kho tumhe bhaddāli tena samayena ahuvattha yadā vo aham ājānīyasusūpamaṃ dhammapariyāyaṃ desesiṃ. Sarasi tvaṃ bhaddālīti* - M.I.445).

On the whole, the Sāriputta episode in the Suttavibhaṅga regarding the origin of *sikkhāpada*, which undoubtedly is a part of the compiler's preface, lacks the historicity of the account in the Bhaddāli Sutta. Sāriputta's inquiries are based on the semi-legendary story of the Buddhas of the past. According to the Suttavibhaṅga, Sāriputta's request to the Buddha to lay down *sikkhāpada* and institute the ritual of the Pātimokkha was prompted by an observation of the catastrophe that befell the monastic communities of the Buddhas of the past which were not adequately bound by restrictive regulations. This, we have no doubt, is historically based on what was actually taking place in the monastic community of Buddha Gotama himself and is projected back into legendary antiquity. This same tendency to seek traditional authority is seen in the Mahāpadāna Sutta where the biographies of the six previous Buddhas are modelled, more or less, on the main outlines of the life of the

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

historical Buddha Gotama.¹ In the Buddhavagga of the Saṃyutta Nikāya, Buddha Gotama's quest of enlightenment is similarly reproduced in relation to the Buddhas of the past.² Furthermore, in the Suttavibhaṅga, the discussion on the promulgation of *sikkhāpada* in relation to the *āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā* or conditions leading to corruption which is placed at a time when there is no evidence either of the presence of *āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā* or the promulgation of *sikkhāpada*, appears to be far more theoretical than the account in the Bhaddāli Sutta which seems to analyse the situation in terms of what was actually taking place. Thus the Suttavibhaṅga account appears to be, more or less, a romanticised version of what is recorded in the Bhaddāli Sutta.

A few points of interest seem to emerge from our earlier reference to the period of twenty years of good monastic discipline.³ While stating that during this period there was no provocation for the promulgation of Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa rules, the Samantapāsādikā goes on to say that during this period the Buddha did however lay down rules pertaining to the remaining five groups of lesser offences (*pañca khuddakāpattikkhandha*) as the occasion demanded (*Atha*

¹ D.II.1-54.

² S.II.5ff.

³ *Supra* p.48.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

bhagavā ajjhācāraṃ apassanto pārājikaṃ vā saṅghādisesaṃ vā na paññāpesi. Tasmim̐ tasmim̐ pana vatthusmim̐ avasese pañca-khuddakāpattikkhandhe'va paññāpesi - VinA.I.213.). This note of the Commentator on the history of the monastic regulations seems to create some problems of anachronism. Of the five groups of *khuddakāpatti* referred to here we note that Thullaccaya,¹ Dukkaṭa² and Dubbhāsita³ are generally derivative offences. The Dukkaṭa has also an independent existence under the Sekhiyā dhammā.⁴ The Thullaccaya on the other hand is derived from a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa offence. As such, it is difficult to push the Thullaccaya back to a period when the major offences themselves were not known to exist. In fact, there is evidence to show that this statement of the Samantapāsādikā was later challenged and not accepted in its entirety. The Sāratthadīpanī Vinaya Tīkā records the tradition of a line of scholars who contend that the five *khuddakāpattikkhandha* referred to here could only be what the Buddha laid down as regulations during the eight years which followed his rains-retreat at Verañjā in the twelfth year of his

¹ Vin.III.30, 33 etc. under Pārājika I; Ibid.116 under Saṅghādisesa I.

² Ibid.36 under Pārājika I; Ibid.118 under Saṅghādisesa. I.

³ Vin.IV.II. under Pācittiya 2.

⁴ Ibid.185 ff.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

enlightenment. Apparently they do not concede the promulgation of any *sikkhāpada* anterior to this.

But the author of the □Ṭikā himself supporting the orthodoxy of the Samantapāsādikā and wishing to push the first promulgation of the *sikkhāpada* of the lesser type to an earlier period, seems to reject this amendment (*Ke ci pana tasmim tasmim pana vatthusmim avasesapañcakhuddakāpattikkhandhe eva paññāpesīti idaṃ dvādasame vasse verañjāya vutthavassena bhagavatā tato paṭṭhāya aṭṭhavassabbhantare paññattasikkhāpadaṃ sandhāya vuttan'ti vadanti. Taṃ na sundaraṃ. Tato pubbe'pi sikkhāpadapaññattiyā sabbhāvato* - Sāratthadīpanī.I.401.). But neither of these traditions seem to question the antiquity of the Thullaccaya over the two major offences of Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa. But there is no doubt that the Thullaccaya had already come to be regarded as one of the group of five offences. If we concede the existence of the fivefold group of lesser offences from the early days of the Sāsana, prior to the rains-retreat at Verañjā, then the request of Sāriputta to the Buddha during his stay at Verañjā, asking him to lay down *sikkhāpada* for the guidance of the monks becomes considerably incongruous. The Sāratthadīpanī, confronted with this anomaly, explains it by saying that the request of Sāriputta was mainly concerned with regulations against grosser offences

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

(*Paṭhamabodhiyaṃ pañcannaṃ lahukāpattīnaṃ
sabbhāvavacanen'eva dhammasenāpaissa
sikkhāpadapaññattiyācanā visesato garukāpattipaññattiyā
pātimokkhuddesassa ca hetubhūtā'ti daṭṭhabbā* -
Sāratthadīpanī.I.401). But this turns out to be a very inadequate
answer which only tends to disintegrate the ingeniously knitted
episode of Sāriputta in the Suttavibhaṅga regarding the
promulgation of *sikkhāpada* by the Buddha for the guidance of
the life of his disciples.

Another instance of unwarranted distortion resulting from
commentarial over-anxiety is found in Buddhaghosa's
explanation of the conditions that lead to the corruption of the
Saṅgha (*āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā*) in the Papañcasūdanī.¹ Since
it is said both in the Bhaddāli Sutta and the Suttavibhaṅga that
the Buddha lays down *sikkhāpada* only at the appearance of
signs of corruption in the Sāsana, Buddhaghosa tries to indicate
some *sikkhāpada* from the extant Vinaya Piṭaka as resulting
from those said conditions. The result, however, is intriguing.
Although the appearance of *āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā* has
repeatedly been mentioned as prompting the promulgation of
sikkhāpada, Buddhaghosa is able to bring before us as
consequent *sikkhāpada* only about six Pācittiya rules and two

¹ MA.III.154 ff.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

regulations regarding Dukkaṭa offences. He has obviously missed the mark. There is no doubt that through some tradition which he inherited he has too narrowly viewed these *āsavaṭṭhāṇiyā dhammā* and the conditions that lead to their appearance. Further, if as he has stated in the *Samantapāsādikā*,¹ the five groups of minor rules had already been laid down previously, prior to the provocation for the promulgation of the major rules at the appearance of the *āsavaṭṭhāṇiyā dhammā*, then it does not appear convincing to regard these minor offences which Buddhaghosa quotes without any reference to major ones as resulting from those conditions. This unwarranted identification of Buddhaghosa has in no way contributed to explain or emphasise the point that the conditions mentioned both in the *Bhaddāli Sutta* and the *Suttavibhaṅga* tended to corrupt the monastic organization, thus compelling the Buddha to set up a body of regulations and thereby arrest this decay. At this stage the instructions of the Dhamma proved ineffective and nothing without monastic legal validity would have compelled the offenders to submit themselves to correction and punishment.

We have now seen the introduction into Buddhist monasticism of restrictive legislation for the purpose of

¹ VinA.I.213.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

maintaining good discipline and furthering the spiritual progress of the disciple. Ten considerations are listed under Pārājika I as well as several other *sikkhāpada* as having motivated the Buddha to lay down *sikkhāpada*.¹ The Buddha declared that he lays down *sikkhāpada* to serve the following needs:

¹ Vin.III.21; IV.9. See A.I.98 for an enlarged list. Also see *supra* p.17.n.1.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

1. *Saṅghasuṭṭhutāya*: well-being of the Saṅgha.
2. *Saṅghaphāsutāya*: convenience of the Saṅgha.
3. *Dummaṅkūnaṃ puggalānaṃ niggaḥāya*: restraint of evil-minded persons.
4. *Pesalānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ phāsuvihārāya*: ease of well-behaved monks.
5. *Diṭṭhadhammikānaṃ āsavānaṃ saṃvarāya*: restraint against the defilements of this life.
6. *Samparāyikānaṃ āsavānaṃ paṭighātāya*: eradication of the defilements of the life after.
7. *Appasannānaṃ pasādāya*: for the conversion of new adherents.
8. *Pasannānaṃ bhiiyobhāvāya*: enhancement of the faith of those already converted.
9. *Saddhammaṭṭhitiyā*: stability and continuance of the Dhamma.
10. *Vinayānuggahāya*: furtherance of the good discipline.

These seem to cover mainly the individual and collective welfare of the disciples, the relation of the disciples to the laymen on whom they are dependent, and the spiritual attainments for the sake of which the disciples take to the monastic life. However, it is clear to us from statements in Canonical Pali literature that these *sikkhāpada* did not, on their introduction, completely displace *sīla* from its position as the

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

basis of a disciple's monastic development.¹ True to the spirit in which they were instituted, they helped to augment *sīla*. In a statement in the Sekha Sutta which enumerates the virtues which make a disciple to be one who is endowed with good living, i.e. *sīlasampanno*, *sīla* still seems to hold its basic position while the discipline through *sikkhāpada* and other means are added on to it (*kathañ ca mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlasampanno hoti. Idha mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlavā hoti pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu.* M.I.355). The Buddha appears to lay special emphasis on *sīla* while speaking of the items which form the foundation for the spiritual development of the monk (*Tasmā' t'īha tvaṃ bhikkhu ādim eva visaodhehi kusalesu dhammesu. Ko c' ādi kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ. Idha tvaṃ bhikkhu pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharāhi ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhāhi sikkhāpadesu. Yato kho tvaṃ bhikkhu sīlaṃ nissāya sīle patiṭṭhāya ime cattāro satipaṭṭhāne evaṃ bhāvēssasi tato tuyhaṃ bhikkhu yā ratti vā divaso vā āgamissati vuddhi y' eva pāṭkañkhā kusalesu dhammesu no parihānīti* - S.V.187).

¹ M.I.33,355; III.2,134; A.II.14 etc.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

According to the definition of *sīlasampanno* quoted above, further to *sīla*, the *sikkhāpada* are drawn into the life of the disciple as providing the necessary guidance for his spiritual development. He is called upon to train and discipline himself in terms of the *sikkhāpada* (*samādāya sikkhāhi sikkhāpadesu*). The Vajjiputtaka monk who confesses to the Buddha his inability to conform to the complete monastic discipline admits his weakness that he cannot discipline himself in terms of the vast dody of *sikkhāpada* which are recited regularly every fortnight (*Sādhikam idaṃ bhante diyaḍḍhasikkhāpadasataṃ anvaddhamāsam uddesaṃ āgacchati. Nā'haṃ bhante ettha sakkomi sikkhitun'ti* - A.I.230). It is implied here that these *sikkhāpada* now form the main stay of the Sāsana for the maintenance of discipline in the Saṅgha. At this stage, with the largely increased number of *sikkhāpada* governing the life of the monk, there arose the need to draw a distinction between the young novice monks called the *sāmaṇera* and the monks of senior status who on being twenty years of age have been elevated to the rank of *upasampanna*. The noviciates are given a code of ten regulations as items of compulsory training and the use of the word *sikkhāpada* is extended to cover these as well.¹ Nine out of these *sikkhāpada* are traceable back to *sīla*:

¹ Vin.I.83.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

nos.1-4 and 9-13 in the lists of *sīla* recommended for the monk.¹ The regulation regarding the use of intoxicants is introduced as the fifth item. It is also the fifth item in the lists of fivefold and eightfold *sīla* laid down for the laymen. But this one relating to intoxicants had no place in the earlier lists of *sīla* of the monk. Reference to the use of intoxicants is also conspicuous by its absence in the lists of *satta* and *dasa kammapatha*.² Nor does it appear under *dasa kusala* or *akusala kamma*.³ On the other hand, it is in one of the regulations of the Vinaya Piṭaka that we discover the circumstances leading to the prohibition of intoxicants for the monks.⁴ It is based on the very sound common sense consideration whether one should drink or take in [the root / *pā* to drink being also used in the sense of - to smoke] anything which would make one lose one's sense of judgement (*Api nu kho bhikkhave taṃ pātabbaṃ yaṃ pivivā visaññī assā'ti* - Vin.IV.110). A more developed and elaborated account of this incident, coupled with a 'story of the past' has found a place in the Jātaka collection.⁵

¹ See Sāmaññaphala Sutta: D.I.63f.

² S.II.167f.

³ M.I.47.

⁴ See Pācittiya 51: Vin.IV.108-10.

⁵ J.I.360f.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

Of the ten *sikkhāpada* laid down for the *sāmaṇera*, the first five seem, more or less, inviolable. The *sāmaṇera* is liable to be expelled for the violation of any one of them (*Tasmā yo pāṇātīpātādisu ekam'pi kammaṃ karoti so liṅganāsanāya nāsetabbo* - VinA.V.1014). Buddhaghosa further stresses this distinction between the first five and the latter five of these *dasasikkhāpadāni* when he says that the violation of the former leads to the expulsion of a *sāmaṇera* while the violation of the latter lead to the imposition of specific punishments (*Dasasu sikkhāpadesu purimānaṃ pañcannaṃ atikkamo nāsanavatthu pacchimānaṃ atikkamo daṇḍakammavatthu*. VinA.V.1012). It is these first five *sikkhāpada* which are also spoken of as the code of the laymen's discipline (*Te ārāmikabhūtā vā upāsakabhūtā vā pañcasu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattanti* - M. II. 5). It has come to be the standardised pattern, for all times, of basic good living for the layman. It is said in the Dhammapada that a man, by the neglect of these considerations, brings about his own ruin in this very life:

*Yo pāṇam atipātetī musāvādañ ca bhāsati
loke adinnaṃ ādiyati paradārañ ca gacchati
surāmerayapānañ ca yo naro anuyuñjati
idh'eva eso lokasmiṃ mūlaṃ khaṇati attano.*

Dhp.vv.246-47.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

A Cakkavatti king is also presented as upholding this fivefold code of lay ethics [*Rājā mahāsudassano evaṃ āha pāṇo na hantabbo adinnaṃ na ādāttabbaṃ kāmesu micchā na caritabbā musā na bhaṇitabbā majjaṃ na pātabbāṃ yathābhuttañ ca bhuñjathā'ti*. D.II.173]. Perhaps the fact that these five sikkhāpada, with the adjustment of abrahmacariyā-veramaṇī or complete celibacy to read as kāmesu micchācārā-veramaṇī or chaste moral behaviour in the case of laymen's sīla, were shared in common both by the laymen and the novice monks made them inviolable in the case of the latter.

The Suttas also record countless occasions on which the Buddha advises his disciples without any reference to *sīla* or *sikkhāpada*, to conduct and discipline themselves in a specific manner (*evaṃ hi vo bhikkhave sikkhitabbaṃ*).¹ It is often said to be under the guidance of the Dhamma (*Tasmā t' iha bhikkhave dhammaṃ yeva sakkaronto dhammaṃ garukaronto dhammaṃ apacāyamānā suvacā bhavissāma sovacassataṃ āpajjisāmā'ti evaṃ hi vo bhikkhave sikkhitabbaṃ* - M.I.126). Not only did this form another source of discipline from the earliest times but also supplemented *sīla* which regulated discipline in terms of word and deed, by bringing within its fold mental discipline as well. This is clearly evident in the Buddha's advice to the

¹ M.I.123ff., 271ff.; II.239.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

Bhikkhus in the Kakacūpama Sutta where they are asked to rid themselves of anger, hatred and ill-will and develop love and magnanimity (*Tatrā'pi kho bhikkhave evaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ na c'eva no cittaṃ vipariṇataṃ bhavissati na ca pāpikaṃ vācaṃ nicchāressāma hitāmukampī ca viharissāma mettacittā na dosantarā tañ ca puggalaṃ mettāsahagatena cetasā pharitvā viharissāma tadārammaṇañ ca sabbāvantaṃ lokaṃ mettāsahagatena cetasā vipulena mahaggatena appamāṇena averena abyāpajjhena pharitvā viharissāmā'ti* - M.I.129). In the passage cited above, although certain patterns of conduct are indicated to the monks, yet there are evidently no *sikkhāpada*. What is referred to here is self-acquired discipline: *evaṃ vo hi bhikkhave sikkhitabbaṃ*. We also notice that *sikkhā* in its most liberal sense, without the aid of *sikkhāpada*, not only thus regulated conduct but also urged the disciple to his highest culture, the attainment of wisdom [*Jarāmarañam bhikkhave ajānatā apassatā yathābhūtaṃ jarāmarañe yathābhūta-ñāṇāya sikkhā karaṇīyā. Evaṃ ... catusaccikaṃ kātabbaṃ* - S.II.131).

We may now safely conclude that *sīla*, *sikkhā* and *sikkhāpada* form the foundations of the life of *brahmacariya* in Buddhism. Not only do we find these perfectly co-ordinated but at times almost identified with one another. With reference to the dichotomous division of Abhisamācārika and Ādibrahmacariyika, *sīla* and *sikkhā* are used as though they were identical

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

with *sikkhāpada* as their subject matter. The Aṅguttara Nikāya divides *sikkhā* into these two categories and includes under *Abhisamācārikā sikkhā* the regulations which determine the outward conduct of the monk in relation to the laymen on whose good will he is dependent (*Idha bhikkhave mayā sāvakānaṃ abhisamācārikā sikkhā paññattā appasannānaṃ pasādāya pasannānaṃ bhīyyobhāvāya. Yathā bhikkhave mayā sāvakānaṃ abhisamācārikā sikkhā paññattā appasannānaṃ pasādāya pasannānaṃ bhīyyobhāvāya tathā so tassā sikkhāya akkhaṇḍakārī hoti acchiddakārī asabalakārī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu. A.II.243*). The Commentary to the Aṅguttara Nikāya, in more than one place, defines *Abhisamācārikā* as *vattavasena paññattasīla* or rules of propriety.¹ The *Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā*, on the other hand, contributes towards the attainment of complete freedom from suffering which is the goal of the life of *brahmacariya* (*Puna ca paraṃ bhikkhave mayā sāvakānaṃ ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā paññattā sabbaso sammā dukkhakkhayāya.... sikkhāpadesu. A.II.243*).

Thus it is clear from both the text and the commentarial notes of the above two passages that *Abhisamācārikā* and *Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā* in Buddhism stood complementary to each other and that they did cover from the earliest times the

¹ AA.III.217, 228, 410.

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

social as well as religious aspects of Buddhist monasticism. Considering the importance which the Buddha attached from the very inception of the Sāsana to the good will of the lay public there is little doubt that *Abhisamācārīkā sikkhā* too, must have played an important part. The Vinaya Piṭaka regards both these as two important aspects of training through which a teacher should put his pupil [*Paṭibalo hoti antevāsiṃ vā saddhivihāriṃ vā abhisamācārīkāya sikkhāya sikkhāpetuṃ ādibrahmacariyikāya sikkhāya vinetuṃ* Vin.I.64).

In the Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa divides *sīla* into *Abhisamācārika* and *Ādibrahmacariyika*, thus exhausting between them the complete monastic discipline and culture which leads up to the termination of *dukkha*. According to Buddhaghosa, the *Abhisamācārika sīla* as the lesser of the two consists of all *sikkhāpada* which are designated as minor in character (*yāni vā sikkhāpadāni khuddānukhuddakānīti vuttāni idaṃ abhisamācārikasīlaṃ sesaṃ ādibrahmacariyikaṃ*. Vism..I. III f.). The rest of the *sikkhāpada* form the *Ādibrahmacariyika*. Buddhaghosa makes the groups more specific when he divides the contents of the Vinaya into two categories as follows. The *Ādibrahmacariyika* consists of the contents of the twofold *Vibhaṅga*. The instructions of the *Khandhakas* form the *Abhisamācārika*, perfection in which assures the attainment of the other (*Ubhatovibhaṅgapariyāpannaṃ vā*

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

ādibrahmacariyaṃ *khandhakavattapariyāpannaṃ*
abhisamācārikaṃ Tassa sampattiyā ādibrahmacariyaṃ
sampajjati - Vism.I.12). In the Samantapāsādikā Buddhaghosa
presents the latter classification as Khandhakavatta and
Sekhapaṇṇatti (*Abhisamācārikāya sikkhāyā'ti khandhakavatte*
vinetuṃ na paṭibalo hotī'ti attho. Ādibrahmacariyāyā'ti
sekhapaṇṇattiyāṃ vinetuṃ na paṭibalo'ti attho - Vin A.V.989f.).

It is clear from what has been stated above that Buddhaghosa not only admits the higher role of the discipline brought about by the Ubhato Vibhaṅga, but also emphasises at the same time the important basic character, in his opinion, of the discipline brought about by the regulations of the Khandhakas. Thus we notice that both these items of Abhisamācārika and Ādibrahmacariyika are, according to Buddhaghosa, products of the Vinaya Piṭaka. The Vinaya Piṭaka in its codified and legalised form, was designed to safeguard the monastic discipline and contribute thereby to the furtherance of the spiritual development envisaged in the Suttas. With the decline of morality and the waning spiritual earnestness among the members of the monastic community such rigorous and binding discipline as is evident in the Vinaya Piṭaka would have become indispensable. The liberalism of the instructions of the Suttas had to become, ere long, a thing of the past. We come to a stage when not only the Pātimokkha but

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

the entire discipline of the Vinaya Piṭaka is looked upon as the fundamental basis on which the Buddhist spiritual perfection of *tisso sikkhā* had to be founded.

According to this view Abhisamācārikā sikkhā which is perfected through the discipline of the Khandhakas had to be accomplished first before the perfection of *sekha dhamma*. On a comparison of commentarial notes we discover that this *sekha dhamma* is equated by Buddhaghosa to *sekha paṇṇattisīla*. (*Sekhaṃ dhamman'ti sekkapaṇṇattiyaṃ* - AA.III.228). In the Samantapāsādikā, Buddhaghosa defines Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā as *sekhapaṇṇatti*. (*Ādibrahmacariyikāyā'ti sekhapaṇṇattiyaṃ*. VinA.V.990). Thus the *sekha dhamma* which can be perfected only after the Abhsamācārikā sikkhā is none other than the Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā. According to a statement in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, it is only after these two stages of Abhisamācārikā and Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā that the successive development through *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā* are considered possible. (*So vata bhikkhave bhikkhu ... abhisamācārikaṃ dhammam aparipūretvā sekhaṃ dhammaṃ paripūressatī'ti... sekhaṃ dhammam aparipūretvā sīlakkhandhaṃ paripūressatī ti..... sīlakkhandham aparipūretvā samādhikkhandhaṃ paripūressati samādhikkahndham*

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

aparipūretvā paññākkhandhaṃ paripūressatī'ti n'etaṃ thānaṃ vijjati. A.III.15).

Here we are led to take note of two different views with regard to the perfection of monastic life. On the one hand, the Abhisamācārikā and Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā are looked upon as exhausting between them the complete monastic discipline and culture leading up to the termination of *dukkha*. (Note: *Puna ca paraṃ bhikkhave mayā sāvakaṇaṃ ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā paññattā sabbaso sammā dukkhakkhayāya.* A.II.243). On the other hand, the Ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā came to be narrowly defined, thus allowing for the integration of these two *sikkhā*, i.e. Abhisamācārika and Ādibrahmacariyika to provide a basis for the perfection of *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā* which once existed independently as a system of monastic culture under the name of *tisso sikkhā*. (Note: *Sakkhasi pana tvaṃ bhikkhu tīsu sikkhāsu sikkhituṃ ... tasmā tuyhaṃ bhikkhu adhisīlam'pi sikkhato adhiccittam'pi sikkhato adhipaññaṃ'pi sikkhato rāgo pahīyissati doso pahīyissati moho pahīyissati.* A.I.230.).

We have thus witnessed in the above discussion the origin and development of Buddhist monastic discipline in terms of *sīla*, *sikkhā* and *sikkhāpada* and the relation in which they stand to the threefold *sikkhā* and to the more codified texts of the Vinaya Piṭaka. They all contribute their share to the perfection of the spiritual development of the disciple and to the attainment

Chapter IV - The Foundations of Monastic Life

of the goal of Arahantship which Buddhism, as a way of life, offers its followers.

CHAPTER V

Further Aids to Monastic Perfection

In the preceding chapter we pointed out the basic position which *sīla* occupies in the spiritual development of the Buddhist disciple and the manner in which *sīla* came to be related to *sikkhā* and *sikkhāpada*. Besides these, the Suttas also know of a number of other items, which together with the above, contribute to the perfection of a disciple. In the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, for instance, we find an account of what constituted the perfect character of the good monk. 'Having thus become a recluse he dwells, 1.disciplined by the restraints of the Pātimokkha, 2.endowed with the propriety of behaviour and conduct, 3.heedful even of the slightest misdeeds, 4.disciplining himself in terms of the moral injunctions, 5.possessed of blameless word and deed, 6.virtuous in his livelihood, 7.full of moral virtue, 8.with well restrained sense organs, 9.endowed with mindfulness and awareness, and 10.full of contentment.' (*Evaṃ pabbajīto samāno 1.pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharatī, 2.ācāragocara-sampanno, 3.anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī, 4.samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu, 5.kāyakammavacīkammena samannāgato kusalena, 6.pari-*

suddhājīvo, 7.sīlasampanno, 8.indriyesu guttadvāro, 9.satisampajaññaena samannāgato, 10.santuṭṭho. D.I.63).

Explaining further the items which are mentioned here, the Sutta deals first with the concept of *sīlasampanno* (7), making an exhaustive analysis of its many aspects. The Sutta proceeds thereafter to *indriyesu guttadvāro* (8), *satisampajaññaena samannāgato* (9) and *santuṭṭho* (10). In its summing up too, the Sutta is concerned only with these four items (*So iminā ca ariyena sīlakkhandhena samannāgato iminā ca ariyena indriyasamvarena samannāgato iminā ca ariyena satisampajaññaena samannāgato imāya ca ariyāya santuṭṭhiyā samannāgato vivittaṃ senāsanam bhajati.* D.I.71). Thus we are naturally led to associate the first six items of the above list from *pātimokkhasamvarasamvuto* (1) to *parisuddhājīvo* (6) with *sīlasampanno* and consider them as subdivisions of the latter. Of these six items, the first four have already appeared together with *sīlavā*, in the definitions of *sīlasampanno* (*Kathaṇ ca mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlasampanno hoti. Idha mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlavā hoti pātimokkhasamvarasamvuto viharati ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu.* M.I.355).¹ Buddhaghosa helps us to include the remaining two items also under the

¹ See also M.I.33,36; III.2,134; S.V.187; A.II.14.

category of *sīla*. In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* he takes these two (*kāyakammavacīkammena samannāgato kusalena* and *parisuddhājīvo*) as complementary to each other and points them out to be really amounting to one thing, namely *sīla* (*Yasmā idaṃ ājīvapārisuddhisīlaṃ nāma na ākāse vā rukkhaggādisu vā uppajjati kāyavacīdvāresu eva pana uppajjati tasmā tassa uppattidvāradassanattthaṃ hāyakammavacīkammena samannāgato kusalenā'ti vuttaṃ. Yasmā pana tena samannāgato tasmā parisuddhājīvo. Mandiyaputtasuttantavasena vā etaṃ. Tattha hi katamañ ca thapati kusalaṃ sīlaṃ. Kusalaṃ kāyakammaṃ vacīkammaṃ. Parisuddhaṃ ājīvaṃ'pi kho ahaṃ thapati sīlasmiṃ vadāmi'ti vuttaṃ. DA.I.181f.*). Buddhaghosa is, no doubt, backed here by the Canonical texts. The *Mandiyaputta Sutta* which he quotes is none other than the *Samaṇamaṇḍikā Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*¹ where *ājīvapārisuddhi* is recognised as a part of good *sīla*.

After *sīla* and its accessory virtues we are introduced to three further items in the spiritual development of the Buddhist disciple, viz. *indriyesu guttadvāratā*, *satisampajañña* and *santutthī*. These together with *sīla*, are to be achieved and accomplished before the disciple embarks on his inner

¹ M.II.27.

purification, commencing with the elimination of the five *nīvaraṇa*.¹ *Indriyaśamvara* or *indriyesu guttadvāratā*, restraint of senses referred to above, appears to take the disciple to a stage beyond *sīla* in that it aims at the discipline of the body as well as of the mind for the sake of further inner development. The disciple begins to regulate, in the light of the instructions of the Master, his responses to the external world through the sense organs so as not to allow evil thoughts which result from excessive desires and dislikes to get the better of him. He needs a cultivated outlook for this purpose. He has to guard his senses with cautions neutrality (*So cakkhunā rūpaṃ disvā na nimittaggāhī hoti nā'nubyañjanaggāhī yatv'ādhikaraṇaṃ eṇaṃ cakkhundriyaṃ asaṃvutaṃ viharantaṃ abhijjhā domanassā pāpakā akusalā dhammā anvāssaveyyuṃ tassa saṃvarāya paṭipajjati rakkhati cakkhundriyaṃ*. D.I.70f.)²

The significant part *indriyaśamvara* thus plays in the religious life of a Buddhist disciple is amply illustrated in the Mahātaṇhāsāṅkhaya Sutta. It points out how unguarded senses upset the poise of mind and enslave one to his sense experiences (*So cakkhunā rūpaṃ disvā piyarūpe rūpe sārājati appiyarūpe rūpe vyāpajjati anupaṭṭhitakāyasati ca viharati*

¹ D.I.70-71; M.I.179-80, 267-68, 345-46.

² See also M.I.179ff, 267ff, 345f.

parittacetaso tañ ca cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ yathābhūtaṃ nappajānāti yattha'ssa te pāpakā akusalā dhammā aparisesā nirujjhanti. So evaṃ anurodhavirodhaṃ samāpanno yaṃ kañ ci vedanaṃ vedeti sukhaṃ vā dukkhaṃ vā adukkhamasukhaṃ vā so taṃ vedanaṃ abhinandati abhivadati ajjhosāya tiṭṭhati. M.I.266). This in turn, it is pointed out, leads to the perpetuation of the saṃsāric process which the Buddhist disciple strives to transcend (*Tassa taṃ vedanaṃ abhinandato abhivadato ajjhosāya tiṭṭhato uppajjati nandī yā vedanāsu nandī tadupādānaṃ tassupādānapaccayā bhavo bhavpaccayā jāti jātipaccayā jarāmaṇaṃ sokaparideva-dukkhadomanassupāyāsā sambhavanti. Evam etassa kevalassa dukkhakkandhassa samudayo hoti.* Ibid.). *Indriyaṣaṃvara* or restraint over sense-faculties is also valued elsewhere as paving the way to *sīla*. It is said that in the absence of *indriyaṣaṃvara*, *sīla* would be without support (*Indriyaṣaṃvare bhikkhave asati indriyaṣaṃvaravipannassa hatūpanisaṃ hoti sīlaṃ.* A.III.360). *Hiroṭappa*, the sense of shame and fear in doing what is wrong, is sometimes added as a virtue which necessarily precedes *indriyaṣaṃvara*.¹ *Satisampajañña* or mental alertness and awareness is considered to be the first and foremost in this whole process of acquiring personal

¹ A.IV.99.

discipline.¹ Regardless of the order in which they are listed, they all aim jointly at *vimutti* or the final liberation from *saṃsāra*.

Besides this, *indriyaśaṃvara* has a secondary importance in that it contributes to the successful practice of the monastic life. It is said that *indriyaśaṃvara* sustains the life of *brahmacariya*: *Indriyaśaṃvaro brahmacariyassa āhāro*. A.V.136. Expressed negatively, it is implied that the lack of *indriyaśaṃvara* is an impediment to it: *Indriyā'saṃvaro brahmacariyassa paripantho*. Ibid. The lure of sensual pleasures which a *pabbajita* has to renounce on leaving the household life was a great force against which he had to be constantly armed. On taking to the monastic career, if the *pabbajita* did not acquire proper control over his senses, temptations of *kāma* would not only defile his mind but also wreck his whole monastic life, swallowing him up in the whirl of worldly pleasures (*So evaṃ pabbajito samāno pubbaṇhasamayam nivāsetvā pattacīvaram ādāya gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā piṇḍāya pavisati arakkhiten'eva kāyena arakkhitāya vā vācāya anupaṭṭhitāya satiyā asaṃvutehi indriyehi. So tattha passati gahapatim vā gahapatiputtam vā pañcahi kāmaguṇehi samappitam samaṅgībhūtam paricārayamānaṃ. Tassa evaṃ hoti mayaṃ kho pubbe agāriyabhūtā samānā pañcahi kāmaguṇehi samappitā*

¹ A.IV.336.

samaṅgībhūtā paricārimha. Saṃvijjante kho kule bhogā. Sakkā bhoge ca bhuñjituṃ puññāni ca kātun'ti. So sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāyā'vattati. Ayaṃ vuccati bhikkhave āvaṭṭabhayassa bhīto sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāyā'vatto. M.I.461). *Indriyaśaṃvara* is also sometimes spoken of as an essential monastic virtue necessary for the safeguarding of a disciple's chastity and therefore also of his whole monastic life. In the absence of such restraint he would succumb to the temptations of the world and would be torn off the moorings of monastic life.¹

On the other hand, the insistence on *indriyaśaṃvara* in Buddhist monasticism is given as a reason why Buddhist disciples, most of whom are described as not being mature in years, have successfully completed their monastic careers. They achieved this end through the restraint of their senses (*Vuttaṃ kho etaṃ mahārāja tena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammā-sambuddhena etha tumhe bhikkhave indriyesu guttadvārā viharatha cakkhunā rūpaṃ disvā ... manindriye śaṃvaraṃ āpajjathā'ti. Ayaṃ kho mahārāja hetu ayaṃ paccayo yen' ime daharā bhikkhū susukālakesā bhadrena yobbanena samannāgatā paṭhamena vayasā anikīlitāvino kāmesu*

¹ M.I.462. Also A.III.95.

Chapter V - Further Aids to Monastic Perfection

yāvajīvaṃ paripuṇṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caranti addhānañ ca āpādentī - S.IV.112.).

Satisampajañña or mental alertness, which comes next, is very generally described as awareness and deliberation over all bodily activities which range from movement of limbs, bodily ablutions and acts of eating and drinking to speech and silence, sleep and wakefulness (*So abhikkante paṭikkante sampajānakārī hoti ālokite vilokite sampajānakārī hoti samiñjite pasārīte sampajānakārī hoti saṅghāṭipattacīvaradhāraṇe sampajānakārī hoti asīte pīte khāyite sāyite sampajānakaī hoti uccārapassavakamme sampajānakārī hoti gate ṭhite nisinne sutte jāgarite bhāsīte tuṅhībhāve sampajānakārī hoti* - M.I.181).

Santuṭṭhi which appears as the last virtue in this list, emphasises a disciple's contentment with regard to his food and clothing, which incidentally had to be of the simplest order (*Seyyathā'pi mahārāja pakkhī sakuṇo yena yen'eva ḍeti sapattabhāro'va ḍeti evam eva mahārāja bhikkhu santuṭṭho hoti kāyaparihārikena cīvarena kucchiparihārikena piṇḍapātena. So yena yen'eva pakkamati samādāy'eva pakkamati.* D.I.71). This virtue of *santuṭṭhi* or contentment is also used in relation to the wider field of requirements of a Buddhist disciple, viz. the fourfold requisites or *catupaccaya* (*Santuṭṭho hoti itarītaracīvara-piṇḍapāta-senāsana-gilānapaccaya-*

bhesajjaparikkhārena. A.III.135). The venerable Mahā Kassapa is held out as a perfect embodiment of this virtue and the other disciples are advised to emulate him (Santutṭhā'yaṃ bhikkhave kassapo itarītarena.... Tasmāt'iha bhikkhave evaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ santutṭhā bhavissāma itarītarena cīvarena itarītaracīvarasantutṭhiyā ca vaṇṇavādino na ca cīvarahetu anesanam appaṭirūpaṃ āpajjissāma. Aladdhā ca cīvaraṃ na paritassissāma laddhā ca cīvaraṃ agadhitā amucchitā anajjhāpanā ādīnavadassāvino nissaraṇapaññā paribhuñjissāma. Evaṃ kātabbaṃ..... itarītarena piṇḍapātena.... itarītarena senāsanena..... itarītarena gilānapaccaya-bhesajjaparikkhārena.... Kassapena vā hi vo bhikkhave ovadissāmi yo vā kassapasadiso. Ovadītehi ca pana vo tathattāya paṭipajjitabban'ti. S.II.194f.). The Khaggavisāṇa Sutta echoes a similar refrain:

*Cātuddiso appaṭiḅho ca hoti
santussamāno itarītarena
parissayānaṃ sahitā achambhī
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.*

Sn.v.42.

'Moving freely in all the four quarters of the world, without any sense of conflict or hostility, content with meagre provisions,

braving all dangers without trepidation, let him wander alone like the rhinoceros.'

Santuṭṭhi also focusses light on the abstemiousness of the disciple which has been praised elsewhere as *santussako ca subhāro ca appakicco ca sallahukavutti*.¹ 'Contented is he and easily supportable. He is abstemious and has few things that he needs to do.' Commenting on the word *santuṭṭho*, Buddhaghosa does, in fact, emphasise this aspect of monastic life (*Iti imassa bhikkhuno sallahukavuttiṃ dassento bhagavā santuṭṭho hoti kāyaparihārikena cīvarenā'ti ādim āha* - DA.I.207). We also witness in the Canonical texts the elaboration of this concept of *santuṭṭhi* under the name of *ariyavaṃsā*. The Saṅgīti Sutta² speaks of *cattāro ariyavaṃsā* or four noble traditions which according to the Commentary are characteristic of the Buddhas and their disciples.³ The Sutta itself calls them ancient traditions: *porāṇā aggaññā ariyavaṃsā*. The Aṅguttara Nikāya also knows of the *ariyavaṃsā*. Describing them in greater detail it claims universal approval and acceptance for them. It is also claimed that they come down from hoary antiquity and have ever since held an unchallenged position. The practice of these

¹ Sn.v.144.

² D.III.224f.

³ DA.III.1009f.

it is said, will enable a monk to resist the temptations of the pleasures of the world and derive sufficient inspiration to fight the spiritual lethargy that would impede his progress (*Cattāro' me bhikkhave ariyavaṃsā aggaññā vaṃsaññā porāṇā asaṃkiñṇā asaṃkiñṇapubbā na saṃkiyanti na saṃkiyissanti appaṭikuṭṭhā samaṇehi brāhmaṇehi viññūhi....Imehi ca pana bhikkhave catūhi ariyavaṃsehi samannāgato bhikkhu puratthimāya ce 'pi disāya viharati sv'eva aratiṃ sahati na taṃ arati sahati....Taṃ kissa hetu. Aratiratisaho hi bhikkhave dhīro'ti* - A.II.27f.). The first three of these *ariyavaṃsā* pertain to a disciple's contentment with regard to his clothing, food and residence respectively. The commentary on the Saṅgīti Sutta points out that being so they fall within the territory of the Vinaya Piṭaka.¹ It also tells us that in compressing the four requisites of the *catupaccaya* within the first three items of *ariyavaṃsā*, *gilāna-paccayabhesajjaparikkhāra* is to be taken as being implicitly included under *piṇḍapāta*.² The fourth place in the list of *ariyavaṃsā* is reserved for the disciple's interest and enthusiasm in his spiritual development, both by the elimination of evil traits of his mind and by his inner culture (*pahānārāmo* and *bhāvanārāmo*). Hence the commentator

¹ DA.III.1017.

² Ibid.1016.

suggests that the other two Piṭakas, Sutta and Abhidhamma, play their role here. Thus it should be noted that this concept of *ariyavaṃsā* is more developed and more comprehensive than the fourfold contentment in relation to the *catupaccaya* which was ascribed to the venerable Mahā Kassapa.¹

As is evident from the text of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, these virtues of *sīla*, *indriyaśamvara*, *satisampajañña* and *santuṭṭhi* undoubtedly constituted the standard pattern of early Buddhist monasticism (*Evaṃ pabbajito samāno pātimokkhasamvarasaṃvuto viharati ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu kāyakammavacīkammena samannāgato kusalena parisuddhājīvo sīlasampanno indriyesu guttadvāro satisampajaññaena samannāgato santuṭṭho*. D.I.63). We also discover in the Canonical texts another list of virtues, somewhat different from the above, which are linked with the disciple's spiritual development under *sīla*. They are as follows:

¹ S.II.194.

1. *sīlavā hoti pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati
ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu
bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu.*
2. *indriyesu guttadvāro.*
3. *bhojane mattaññū.*
4. *jāgariyaṃ anuyutto.*
5. *satisampajaññaena samannāgato.*¹

As in the former list the cultivation of these virtues here prepares the disciple for the elimination of the five *nīvaraṇa*. Thus both these lists which start with *sīla* appear to be similar in their scope. They are in fact identical as far as *sīla* and *indriyasaṃvara* are concerned. The latter list adds thereafter two new items in *bhojane mattaññutā* and *jāgariyānuyoga*. It leaves out *santuṭṭhi* of the former, but agrees with it in retaining *satisampajañña*.

As we examine the concept of *bhojane mattaññutā*, it appears as though considerations regarding the acceptance and use of food assumed, in course of time, increasing importance in Buddhist monasticism, and that it led to this special mention of moderation in eating. The broader concept of *santuṭṭhi* which covers all the needs of a disciple besides food is

¹ M.III.2, 134

thus replaced by this narrower one of *bhojane mattaññūtā*, perhaps with the intention of being more specific. In its wider interpretation, however, *bhojane mattaññūtā* was taken to be equivalent to *santuṭṭhi* as is evident from the comment of Buddhaghosa which says that *bhojane mattaññūtā* brings to light such virtues like contentment: *bhojane mattaññū'ti idam assa santosādiguṇaparidīpam*. VibhA.323. Heedlessness in eating was considered a danger not only to the physical well-being but also to the mental poise and spiritual development of the disciple. In several suttas like the *Kakacūpama*, *Bhaddāli* and *Laṭukikopama*,¹ the Buddha speaks of the physical benefits which result from moderation and regularity in meals. A verse in the *Theragāthā* almost specifies the quantity of food to be consumed by a monk.

*Cattāro pañca ālope abhutvā udakaṃ pive
alam phāsuvihārāya pahitattassa bhikkhuno.*

Thag.v.983.

'Let him drink water after his meal while he leaves four or five mouthfuls of food yet uneaten. This is conducive to the ease and comfort of the disciple who is striving for his emancipation.'

¹ M.I.124, 437, 448.

It is suggested in the Commentaries that these bounds of propriety apply not only to the quantity of food consumed but also to the amount sought and accepted (*Bhojane mattaññutā'ti bhojane yā mattā jānitabbā pariyesana-paṭiggahana-paribhogesu yuttatā*. MA.I.152). The Vatthūpama Sutta negatively implies the dangers to spiritual life of the proneness to pleasures in eating.¹ A disciple of such virtue and wisdom, even if he were to partake of a delicious and delightful meal, would not thereby bring ruin upon his spiritual life (*Sa kho so bhikkhave bhikkhu evaṃsīlo evaṃdhammo evampañño sālīnañ ce'pi piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjati vicitakālakaṃ anekasūpaṃ anekabyañjanaṃ nev'assa taṃ hoti antarāyāya*. M.I.38).

Thus *bhojane mattaññutā* became an important item of monastic discipline. True to the injunction under *santuṭṭhi* (*santuṭṭho hoti kucchiparihārikena piṇḍapātena*) it not only sets the limit on the quantity of food, but also corrects the disciple's attitude to the use of food in general.² The disciple is advised to eat his food with the awareness that he does so in order to maintain his physical fitness, free from pain, that he may further his religious pursuit of *brahmacariya*. He should eschew all desires of physical perfection and adornment (*Ehi tvam bhikkhu*

¹ M.I.38.

² M.III.2.

Chapter V - Further Aids to Monastic Perfection

bhojane mattaññū hohi paṭisaṅkhā yoniso āhāreyyāsi neva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya yāvad'ev'imassa kāyassa t̥hitiyā yāpanāya vihiṃsūparatiyā brahmacariyānuggahāya - M.III. 2). The Dhammapada views it from many other angles. Moderation in eating is said to be a great asset in the battle against the forces of evil. The disciple who along with other virtues possesses a sense of moderation in eating shall not easily be swayed by Māra. It is said that the disciple should take his food with the awareness that it should contribute so much to his physical well being as would be needed for the successful completion of his life of *brahmacariya*.

*Asubhānupassim viharantaṃ indriyesu susaṃvutaṃ
bhojanamhi ca mattaññuṃ saddhaṃ āradhaviṛiyaṃ
taṃ ve nappasahati māro vāto selaṃ'va pabbataṃ.*

Dhp. v. 8.

It is also listed there among the basic injunctions of the Buddhas.

*Anūpavādo anūpaghāto pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro
mattaññutā ca bhattasmiṃ panthañ ca sayanāsanam
adhicitte ca āyogo etaṃ buddhāna sāsanaṃ.*

Dhp.v.185.

This added emphasis which seems to be centered on the question of food does not appear to have resulted from mere theoretical considerations. Evidence of both the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas show that restrictions on food were constantly being challenged and violated by rebellious disciples even during the time of the Buddha. Bhaddāli tells the Buddha of his inability to practise the habit of one meal a day (*Evaṃ vutte āyasmā bhaddāli bhagavantam etad 'avoca. Aham kho bhante na ussahāmi ekāsanabhojanaṃ bhuñjitum* - M.I.437). The Laṭukikopama Sutta expresses through the words of Udāyi what might have been the general protest at the prohibition to the monks of the night meal and meals out of hours.¹ Similarly, we witness in the Kīṭāgiri Sutta the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, who being told about the Buddha's abstemious ways relating to food, argue on the merits of plentiful meals.² We also come across a number of supplementary rules on the

¹ M.I.448.

² Ibid.473.

acceptance and use of food which were laid down by the Buddha as a result of certain irregularities indulged in by erring disciples. Once a number of monks, fearing that they would get only a frugal meal at the house of a poor man who had invited them, collected an early meal and enjoyed it beforehand. This led to the promulgation of Pācittiya 33.¹ In the history of Pācittiya 35 we discover monks taking a second meal elsewhere after they had concluded their meal at one place.² Pācittiya 37 had to be laid down as a special safeguard against eating after hours.³ It should here be observed that all these situations are implicitly guarded against under *sīla* in the *sikkhāpada* which pertains to food, that the disciple takes only one meal a day, abstaining from the night meal and meals after hours (*Ekabhattiko hoti rattūparato virato vikālabhojanā*. D.I.64).

Considering all these dangers which could possibly befall Buddhist monasticism in general and the spiritual life of the disciple in particular through an untutored attitude to food, it is little wonder that *bhojane mattaññutā* became a special monastic virtue. We notice further a new attitude to food being cultivated by the Buddhist disciples which came to be regarded

¹ Vin.IV.76f.

² Vin.IV.81.

³ Ibid.85.

as one among seven conditions which lead to enlightenment.¹ It is an acquired feeling of disgust and detachment towards food which a disciple is called upon to develop gradually, stage by stage (*Tasmim āhāre paṭikkūlākāraggaḥavasena uppannā saññā āhāre paṭikkūlasaññā* - Vism.341.). What is intended thereby is that a disciple's mind may never be enslaved through his greed for food (*Āhāre paṭikkūlasaññā bhikkhave bhāvitā bahulikatā mahapphalā hoti mahānisamsā amatogadhā amatapariyosānā'ti iti kho pan 'etaṃ vuttaṃ kiñc'etaṃ paṭicca vuttaṃ. Āhāre paṭikkūlasaññāparicitenā bhikkhave bhikkhuno cetasā bahulaṃ viharato rasataṇhāya cittaṃ paṭilīyati paṭikuṭṭati paṭivattati na sampasāriyati upekkhā vā paṭikkūlyatā vā saṇṭhāti.* A.IV.49). The Visuddhimagga considers that the acquisition of this attitude would serve as a prelude to the complete eradication of lust centering on the fivefold pleasures of the senses (*Atha 'ssa appakasiren'eva kabalinīkārahārapariññāmukhena pañcakāmaguṇiko rāgo pariññāṃ gacchati.* Vism.347). The origin of this idea of Buddhaghosa is in fact traceable back to Canonical texts. The Samyutta Nikāya (S.II.98) records a statement by the Buddha himself where he says that once a complete mastery over one's attitude to solid food of daily consumption has been gained

¹ S.V.132; A.IV.46.

(*kabalīnkāra-āhāre pariññāte*), one gains restraint over one's attitude to the entire range of fivefold sense pleasures or *pañcakāmaguṇika-rāga*. It is the vision of such possibilities, no doubt, which set a high premium on *āhāre paṭikkūlasaññā* and led to its being considered as a factor leading to *nibbāna* (*amatogadhā amatapariyosānā*).¹

Jāgariyānuyoga too, like *bhojane mattaññutā*, is a very specific virtue. It refers to both physical wakefulness and mental alertness through control of sleep. *Satisampajañña* which was referred to earlier, concerns itself with the vigilance of a disciple. But *jāgariyānuyoga* demands that a disciple should harness that vigilance to bring about the purge of his mind of the defiling traits. We notice that instead of replacing *satisampajañña*, *jāgariyānuyoga* augments it by adding this active mind-culture as another important monastic virtue. Thus the second list of monastic virtues is completed with *satisampajañña* as the last of its items.

Out of the virtues enumerated in this second list three have come to deserve special consideration in that they are often listed together as basic virtues necessary for the successful continuance of monastic life as well as for the attainment of the

¹ A.IV.49.

final goal of Arahantship. The catastrophic failure in spiritual life, resulting from their absence, is relentlessly stated as follows: *So vata āvauso bhikkhu indriyesu aguttadvāro bhojane amattaññū jāgariyaṃ ananuyutto yāvajīvaṃ paripuṇṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ santānessatīti n'etaṃ thānam vijjati.* (S.IV.103f.). It is in terms of these monastic virtues that the venerable Mahā Kassapa judged the followers of Ānanda and declared them to be immature and unworthy.¹ However, we notice that no mention is made here of *sīla*. Perhaps it is implicitly taken to be contained within the framework of these three items of *indriyaṣaṃvara*, *bhojane mattaññutā* and *jāgariya*. They lead to the physical and mental well-being of a disciple in this very life and pave the way for the attainment of Arahantship (*Tīhi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato bhikkhu diṭṭhe'va dhamme sukhasomanassabahulo viharati yoni ca'ssa āradhā hoti āsavānaṃ khayāya. Katamehi tīhi. Indriyesu guttadvāro hoti bhojane mattaññū jāgariyaṃ anuyutto.* S.IV.175f.). The Aṅguttara reiterates this idea, declaring the infallibility of these virtues.² There is no doubt that they formed a powerful triad in the development of monastic life. However, we find at times *satisampajañña* appended to these as a fourth

¹ S.II.218.

² A.I.113.

Chapter V - Further Aids to Monastic Perfection

(Kimaññatra bhikkhave nando indriyesu guttadvāro bhojane mattaññū jāgariyam anuyutto satisampajaññena samannāgato yena nando sakkoti paripuṇṇam parisuddham brahmacariyaṃ carituṃ. A.IV.166).

CHAPTER VI

The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

The final and what is claimed to be the most comprehensive code of monastic discipline is brought under the fourfold division of *sīla* known as the Catupārisuddhisīla. Buddhaghosa begins his *Visuddhimagga*, more or less, with a detailed analysis of this classification.¹ Like the earlier lists of *sīla* which had *indriyaśamvara* closely appended to it,² this classification seems to recognise the basic importance of the two items of *sīla* and *indriyaśamvara*. Buddhaghosa goes so far as to say that no perfection in *sīla* could be achieved without stability in *indriyaśamvara* (*Evam asampādite hi etasmim pātimokkhasamvarasīlam'pi anaddhaniyaṃ hoti aciraṭṭhitikaṃ...* Vism.I.37). However, the earlier concept of *sīla* as expressed in the Suttas in the reference *iminā ariyena sīlakkhandhena samannāgato* now forms only one single fragment in this larger fourfold classification. The earlier concept is narrowed down and is specifically referred to as Pātimokkhasamvarasīla. In this

¹ Vism.I.15f.

² D.I.71; M.I.181.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

division of *sīla* the emphasis is more on the codified legalised precepts. The sole basis of monastic discipline now seems to be the code of the Pātimokkha which is aptly described by Buddhaghosa as the *sikkhāpada-sīla*.¹ Here one immediately feels that there is a complete disregard of the role of the Dhamma as a disciplinary force among the disciples. This new attitude is perhaps resonant of an age in which the Vinaya dominated. Buddhaghosa does bring before us in clearer relief the tendency of his day when he says that the Vinaya constitutes the life-blood of the Sāsana.² However, it is interesting to note that the Vimuttimaggā which is claimed to be a pre-Buddhaghosa work³ adds the following remarks after its definition of *pātimokkhasaṃvara*: This is the entrance into the doctrines. By this the Good Law (*saddhamma*) is accepted.⁴ One is tempted by this to ask whether the reference to the Good Law (*saddhamma*) under the definition of

¹ *Pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto'ti ettha pātimokkhan'ti sikkhāpadasīlaṃ*
- Vism.I.16.

² *Vinayo nāma buddhasāsanassa āyu vinaye ṭhite sāsanaṃ ṭhitaṃ*
hoti - DA.I.11.

³ *Vimuttimaggā: The Path of Freedom*. Introduction p.xliv.

⁴ *Ibid*.17.

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

pātimokkhasaṃvara implies in this context a recognition of the wide range of monastic discipline and a desire to infuse the spirit of the Dhamma into the legal machinery of the Vinaya which tended to be exclusive in character in the regulation of monastic life.

Indriyasaṃvarasīla forms the second item in this fourfold classification. It has retained its character, more or less unmodified in the new classification.¹ *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla* and *Paccayasannissitasīla* form the last two items. These are concerned with the daily life of the disciple, specially in relation to his food and clothing. The Suttas too are adequately concerned with this aspect of monastic discipline although it had not come to be laid down in the form of a division of *sīla*. The *ājīvapārisuddhi*, as a separate item of *sīla* in the new fourfold category, claims to safeguard the way in which a disciple 'earns his living' without fraud and deceit, and greed for gain, and thus renders him blameless with regard to his livelihood. It is possible to infer from Buddhaghosa's definition of *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla*² that the origin of this special branch of

¹ Vism.I.20f.

² Ibid.16, 30. It must be mentioned here that Buddhaghosa, in his definition of *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla*, first refers to the six rules drawn from

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

sīla lay primarily in the last item of *Majjhimasīla* given in the Brahmajāla and the Sāmaññaphala Suttas.¹ Buddhaghosa quotes it as follows: ... *kuhanā lapanā nemittakatā neppesikatā lābhena lābhaṃ nijigimśanatā'ti evam ādīnañ ca pāpadhammānaṃ vasena pavattā micchājīvā virati*. Vism.I.16. It is also of interest to note that the Mahācattārīsaka Sutta defines *micchājīva* solely in terms of this item of *sīla*.² Buddhaghosa further suggests that along with this are also to be taken the different forms of unworthy professional practices or *micchājīva* which are elaborated under the *mahāsīla*.³ To supplement this concept of Ājīvapārisuddhi Buddhaghosa also draws reinforcements from the Vinaya. These consist of six *sikkhāpada* from the Suttavibhaṅga and Buddhaghosa

the Suttavibhaṅga and then to the conditions discussed under *sīla*. This is apparently due to the overwhelming authority which the Vinaya had acquired in his day.

¹ D.I.8. Sec.20; Ibid.67 Sec.55.

² *Katamo ca bhikkhave micchā ājīvo. Kuhanā lapanā nemittakatā nippesikatā lābhena lābhaṃ nijigimśanatā. Ayaṃ bhikkhave micchā ājīvo* - M.III.75.

³ *Iti ādinā nayena brahmajāle vuttānaṃ anekesaṃ gahaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ* - Vism.I.30. Also see Mahāsīla at D.I.9f, 67f.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

describes them as being `laid down for the guidance of the livelihood of the monk ': *ājīvahetu paññattānaṃ channaṃ sikkhāpadānan'ti yāni tāni ... evaṃ paññattāni cha sikkhāpadāni*. Vism.I.22. They occur already together in a group in the Parivāra as constituting in their violation *ājīvavipatti* or damage to the purity of livelihood.¹

Of these, five *sikkhāpada* are primary regulations directly traceable to the Pātimokkha. The other is a Thullaccaya offence derived from the fourth Pārājika. The Dukkaṭa offence is in terms of Sekhiyadhamma 37. In their gravity, these *sikkhāpada* range from a Pārājika to a Dukkaṭa offence. Three minor rules, a Pācittiya (Vin.IV.88), Pāṭidesanīya (Vin.IV.347f.) and a Dukkaṭa (Vin.IV.193) are concerned with irregular appropriation of food. Two rules, a Pārājika (Vin.III.91) and a Thullaccaya (Vin.III.102 Sec.7) deal with claims to spiritual powers which are made with a view to increase the support from laymen. One rule, a Saṅghādisesa (Vin.III.139) proscribes the transaction of the affairs of laymen with a similar motive of personal gain. It is also interesting to note that Buddhaghosa bundles up under the one Pāṭidesanīya *sikkhāpada* all the eight Pāṭidesanīya rules of

¹ *Ājīvahetu ājīvakāraṇā pāpiccho... bhuñjati. Ayaṃ sā ājīvavipatti sammatā* - Vin.V.146.

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

the Bhikkhunis.¹ He is perhaps here influenced by the single Pācittiya rule (no. 39) of the Bhikkhus which covers the same ground. Thus the *ājīvapārisuddhi* is judged in terms of both *sīla* and the codified rules of the Vinaya.² On the other hand, we notice that in the earlier texts, the concept of *ājīvapārisuddhi* was brought within the scope of *sīla* itself.³ Its aim was to make the disciples purge themselves of such mean traits of character (*pāpadhammā*) as fraud and deceit,⁴ as well as to make them abstain from blamable forms of livelihood (*micchājīva*) which are unworthy of a monk. But Buddhaghosa makes a further distinct group of *micchājīva* in terms of the transgression of the rules of the Pātimokkha: *ājīvahetupaññattānaṃ channaṃ sikkhāpadānaṃ vītikkamavasena*. (Vism.I.30).

As far as the disciples of the Buddha were concerned, the items of *micchājīva* which are more or less professional practices were firstly considered stupid (*tiracchāna-vijjā*),

¹ Vism.I.22

² Ibid.16, 30.

³ *Ājīvapārisuddhim'pi kho ahaṃ thapati sīlasmiṃ vadāmi*. M.II.27. See also items 37-43 in the lists of *sīla* given in the Brahmajāla and Sāmaññaphala Suttas.

⁴ Vism.I.16, 30.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

perhaps because they exploited the credulity and the superstitious character of the public on whom they were dependent. Secondly, they were irregular practices for the monk (*micchājīva*), for they were not conducive to his spiritual progress. It would be a misuse of his life if he engaged himself in such activities. There can be little doubt that *kāyakamma-vacīkammena samannāgato kusalena* served as a warning against such irregular ways of members of the monastic community.¹ Thus we notice *parisuddhājīvo* being rightly equated by Buddhaghosa to *kāyakamma-vacīkammena samannāgato kusalena*.² It must be observed that the *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla* as described by Buddhaghosa overlaps to some extent the *Pātimokkhasaṃvarasīla* in that Buddhaghosa while recognising the various irregular ways of a monk enumerated under *sīla* (*kuhanā lapanā* etc.) draws also on the contents of the *Pātimokkha*.³

The last item in this fourfold classification is the *Paccayasannissitasīla*. While the *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla* is

¹ D.I.63.

² DA.I.181f.

³ The clause which pertains to the Thullaccaya offence occurs outside the *Pātimokkha* but is still within the *Suttavibhaṅga*.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

concerned with the correctness of the method whereby the monk obtains his requisites, the Paccayasannissitasīla determines the correct attitude of mind in the use of these.¹ The Sabbāsava Sutta deals comprehensively with this consideration in relation to the use of the four *paccaya*.² Buddhaghosa quotes freely from this Sutta in his description of the Paccayasannissitasīla.³ *Bhojane mattaññutā* which was discussed earlier,⁴ tended to single out food from among these four requisites and lays special emphasis on moderation in eating as a monastic virtue. The Paccayasannissitasīla seems to reintroduce to monastic life the above considerations of the Sabbāsava Sutta in their widest application.⁵

Canonical Pali literature does not make any reference to this fourfold classification of Catupārisuddhisīla. The Paṭisambhidāmagga knows the term *Pārisuddhisīla* but it is used in the very general sense of a 'code of good living leading

¹ Vism.I.16.

² M.I.10.

³ Vism.I.16

⁴ *Supra* p.58, 60.

⁵ Vism.I.30f.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

to purity'.¹ It is presented there in five categories which are graded according to the degree of perfection of each. Speaking of a fivefold classification of *sīla* in the Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa reproduces this division of Pārisuddhisīla of the Paṭisambhidāmagga.² The classification is as follows:

- 1 *Pariyantapārisuddhisīl* - *anupasampannānaṃ*
· *a* *pariyantasikkhānaṃ*
- 2 *Apariyantapārisuddhisī* - *upasampannānaṃ*
· *la* *apariyantasikkhānaṃ*
- 3 *Paripuṇṇapārisuddhisīl* - *puthujjanakalyāṇakānaṃ*
· *a* *kusaladhamme yuttānaṃ*
sekhapariyante
paripūrakāriṇaṃ kāye ca
jivite ca anapekkhānaṃ
pariccattajīvitānaṃ
- 4 *Aparāmaṭṭhapārisuddh* - *sattannaṃ sekhānaṃ*
· *isīla*
- 5 *Paṭippassaddhipārisud* - *tathāgatasāvakānaṃ*

¹ Pts.I.42.

² Vism.I.46.

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

- . *dhisīla* *khīṇāsavānaṃ*
paccekabuddhānaṃ
tathāgatānaṃ arahantānaṃ
*sammāsambuddhaānaṃ*¹

These refer to the various stages in the development of *sīla* or moral virtue in Buddhism, from the uninitiated disciple to the Tathāgatas. It is difficult to determine with any certainty whether the concept of *pārisuddhisīla* as the 'code of good living leading to purity' heralded the later classification of the Catupārisuddhisīla. However, it has already been pointed out that the aspects of monastic discipline contained under the Catupārisuddhisīla are of Canonical origin.² Like *sīla*, they were considered among the necessary accomplishments of monastic life, and as such some of them stood beside *sīla* under their own name. Thus they were never reckoned as divisions of *sīla*. Nevertheless, with the lapse of time, we witness the expansion of the scope and function of *sīla* as it brings within its fold the entire range of monastic development which culminates in the

¹ Pts.I.42f.

² *Supra* p.61.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

attainment of Arahantship.¹ Thus *sīla*, from its position of being the first and basic stage in the threefold training of a disciple (*tisso sikkhā*) came, more or less, to be identified with the complete concept of *sikkhā* itself. The first clear indication of an adequate elaboration of *sīla* capable of accomodating the new element is seen in the Milindapañha where the venerable Nāgasena tells King Milinda that the *sīlaratana* of the Buddha consists of Pātimokkhasaṃvara, Indriyasaṃvara Ājīvapārisuddhi and Paccayasannissita sīlas as well as of the Cūlla, Majjhima, Mahā and Magga and Phala sīlas (*Katamaṃ mahārāja bhagavato sīlaratanaṃ. Pātimokkhasaṃvara-sīlam indriyasaṃvarasīlam ājīvapārisuddhisīlam paccayasannissitasīlam cullasīlam majjhimasīlam mahāsīlam maggasīlam phalasīlam* - Miln.336). It also occurs in a statement by King Milinda where he refers to the development of a disciple in terms of the four categories of *sīla*: *catusu sīlakkhandhesu sammā paripūrakāri*. Miln.243. Although the term Catupārisuddhisīla is not used here, there is no doubt that the fourfold classification had already gained considerable recognition, for the threefold division of Cūla, Majjhima and Mahā sīlas which is the Canonical classification is accorded

¹ *Arahattamaggena sabbakilesānaṃ pahānaṃ sīlaṃ* - Pts.I.47.

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

here the second place after the enumeration of the four items of *sīla* which constitute the Catupārisuddhisīla.

This fourfold classification of *sīla* which evidently is one of post-canonical origin seems to have been a subject of great controversy in later monastic history. Even during the time of Buddhaghosa the Catupārisuddhisīla does not seem to have enjoyed an unchallenged position. Buddhaghosa who describes it in great detail in the Visuddhimagga also records elsewhere the disputes which seem to have arisen on this subject. According to him, a learned Buddhist monk of Sri Lanka by the name of Culābhaya Thera who was a Master of the Tipiṭaka [*Tipiṭka Culābhaya Thera*] refused to accept, in the absence of Canonical authority, the importance attached to Indriyaśamvara, Ājīvapārisuddhi and Paccayasannissita as separate items of *sīla*. He challenged the view of his teacher, Sumana Thera of Dīpavihāra, who held that the term *sīla* was used in the Canonical texts to mean implicitly the wider concept covered under the fourfold classification. To Sumana Thera *sīla* meant something more than the discipline brought about by the Pātimokkha, although he was quick and ready to recognise the very significant part it played in the life of a monk. Commenting

Chapter VI - The New Role of *Sīla* in Buddhist Monasticism

on the term *sampannasīla* in the Ākankheyya Sutta,¹ Buddhaghosa brings to light these differences of opinion (*Tattha sampannasīlā'ti ettāvatā kira bhagavā catupārisuddhisīlaṃ uddisitvā pātimokkhasaṃvarasampannā'ti iminā tattha jetṭhakasīlaṃ vitthāretvā dassesī'ti dīpavihāravāsī sumanatthero āha. Antevāsiko pana 'ssa tipītakacūlābhayatthero āha. Ubhayatthā'pi pātimokkhasaṃvaro bhagavatā vutto. Pātimokkhasaṃvaro y 'eva hi sīlaṃ. Itarāni pana tīni sīlan'ti vuttatṭhānaṃ nāma atthī'ti ananujānanto vatvā āha. MA.I.155*)²

Even if we would agree with the learned Cūlābhaya Thera and argue that the recognition of such items as Paccayasannissita and Ājivapārisudhi as separate items of *sīla* is a matter of post-Canonical origin, Cūlābhaya Thera is himself liable to be accused of viewing *sīla* too narrowly by identifying it totally with the Pātimokkha. *Sīla* would thereby be robbed of its spirit to some extent and be made effective only by the mechanism of the Pātimokkha. However, the Pātimokkha was only an aid to the perfection of *sīla* and therefore the old stereotyped description of a *sīlasampanno* invariably mentions *sīla* first and then follows it with Pātimokkhasaṃvara etc.

¹ M.I.33.

² Also SA.III.230.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

(Kathañ ca mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlasampanno hoti. Idha mahānāma ariyasāvako sīlavā hoti pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati... M.I.355).

But with the increasing importance which the text and the ritual of the Pātimokkha gradually assumed in the early days of Buddhist monasticism we are not surprised to find in the Canonical texts themselves a virtual identification of the very comprehensive concept of *sīla* with the Pātimokkha. In doing so, at least theoretically, the scope of the Pātimokkha was considerably widened. A passage in the Aṅguttara Nikāya refers to the complete grounding in *sīla* simply as *pātimokkhasaṃvara* (*Etha tumhe āvuso sīlavā hotha pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvutā viharatha ācāragocarasampannā anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvino samādaya sikkhatha sikkhāpadesū'ti. Iti pātimokkhasaṃvare samādapetabbā nivesetabbā patiṭṭhāpetabbā. A.III.138*). On the other hand, we find in the Saṃyutta Nikāya a passage which describes the discipline of a monk with the rest of the above phraseology, leaving out the reference to *sīla*. However, the discipline so described is recognised in the end as the grounding in *sīla* (*Yato kho tvam bhikkhu pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharissasi ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu*

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhasi sikkhāpadesu tato tvam bhikkhu sīlaṃ nissāya sīle paṭiṭṭhāya cattāro satipaṭṭhāne bhāveyyāsi - S.V.187) Thus there seems to be a mutual identification of *sīla* and the Pātimokkha. Evidently, Cūlābhaya Thera found here a point in his favour and Buddhaghosa himself remarks that this establishes the superiority of the Pātimokkhasaṃvarasīla over the other *sīlas* in the fourfold classification.¹ Cūlābhaya Thera argues that the other three items of this classification are never referred to as *sīla* and dismisses them as elementary considerations relating to the control of sense faculties and to the acceptance and use of a disciple's food and raiment.² Nevertheless, Buddhaghosa is anxious to maintain that the Pātimokkha by itself does not

¹ *Pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto'ti catunnaṃ sīlānaṃ jeṭṭhakasīlaṃ dassento evaṃ āha* - SA.III.230.

² *Itarāni pana tīni sīlan'ti vuttaṭṭhānaṃ nāma natthī'ti vatvā ananujānanto āha. Indriyasaṃvaro nāma chadvārarakkhanamattaṃ eva. Ājīvapārisuddhi dhammen'eva samena paccayuppattimattakaṃ paṭiladdhapaccaye idamatthan'ti paccavekkhitvā paribhuñjanamattakaṃ. Nippariyāyena pātimokkhasaṃvaro'va sīlaṃ* - SA.III.230. Also MA.I.155.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

complete the discipline of a monk.¹ The Pātimokkha being essentially an organ of Buddhist Vinaya aimed at the correction only of word and deed. This is clearly stated to be the avowed purpose of the Vinaya Piṭaka as is borne out by the definitions of Vinaya given by Buddhaghosa.² But the complete development of a Buddhist disciple included the discipline of his mind as well. As the Catupārisuddhi-sīla was meant to be the complete and comprehensive code of Buddhist monastic discipline, it was argued that the development of the mind of the disciple which the Pātimokkha did not take within its fold was brought about by the rest of these divisions of *sīla*.³ Thus Buddhaghosa would speak of the good disciples as being established in this fourfold *sīla* for the perfection of their religious life.⁴

¹ *Sattame kāyasucaritavacīsucaritāni pātimokkhasaṃvarasīlaṃ manosucaritaṃ itarāni tīni sīlānī'ti catupārisuddhisīlaṃ kathitaṃ hoti* - SA.III.230.

² *Kāyikavācasikaajjhācāranisedhanato c'esa kāyaṃ vācañca vineti. Tasmā vividhanayattā visesanayattā kāyavācānañca vinayanato vinayo'ti akkhāto* - VinA.I.19. See also DA.I.17. and DhsA.I.17

³ SA.III.230.

⁴ MA.II.5-6.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

This deficiency of the Pātimokkha, and therefore also of the earlier *sīlakkhandha* referred to in the Suttas, which is pointed out here had been remedied to some extent by the discipline of *indriyaśamvara* which was closely coupled with *sīla* from the earliest times. Hence we would readily concede the elaboration of the *indriyaśamvara* into a separate item of *sīla* which contributes to the mental discipline of a monk. But the formulation of Ājīvapārisuddhi and Paccayasannissita in their present form in the Catupārisuddhisīla seems more to hint at the concern over the behaviour of the growing monastic community.

It is of interest to note that while Buddhaghosa records the divergent evaluations of the Catupārisuddhisīla, he also makes a genuine attempt to place before us this fourfold classification with a definite note of recommendation. In the Visuddhimagga he shows us how these four items of *sīla* bring into play essential monastic virtues like *saddhā*, *sati*, *virīya* and *paññā*.¹ It is also shown that they contribute towards a fourfold purification

¹ Vism.I.35, 36, 40, 43.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

in the life of the monk: *catubbidhā hi suddhi*.¹ In terms of the *sīla* which bring about these aspects of purification they are:

- a) *Desanāsuddhi* : Pātimokkhasaṃvarasīla.
- b) *Samvarasuddhi* : Indriyasaṃvarasīla.
- c) *Pariyeṭṭhisuddhi* : Ājīvapārisuddhisīla.
- d) *Paccavekkhaṇasuddhi* : Paccayasannissitasīla²

There is a passage in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā which in its comment on a verse in the Bhikkhuvagga,³ attempts to equate the Catupārisuddhisīla to the three items of *pātimokkhasaṃvara*, *indriyagutti* and *santuṭṭhi* of Canonical antiquity. In doing so it is constrained to accommodate both Ājīvapārisuddhi and Paccayasannissita sīlas under *santuṭṭhi* which is explained as contentment with regard to the four requisites.⁴ The Vimuttimagga⁵ seems to go a step further in

¹ Ibid.43f.

² Ibid.43-44.

³ *Tatrāyam ādi bhavati idha paññassa bhikkhuno indriyagutti santuṭṭhi pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro*. DhA.IV.107.v.375.

⁴ *Tatra indriyaguttīti indriyasaṃvaro santuṭṭhīti catupaccayasantoso. Tena ājīvapārisuddhiñ c'eva paccayasannissitañ ca sīlaṃ kathitaṃ* - DhA.IV.III.

⁵ *Vimuttimagga: The Path of Freedom*. p.24.

Chapter VI - The New Role of Sīla in Buddhist Monasticism

that it tries to establish with finality the significance of the Catupārisuddhisīla in Buddhist monasticism by equating the four items of *sīla* to the three *sikkhā* of *sīla*, *samādhī* and *paññā*. In the light of all these observations it becomes clear that the Catupārisuddhisīla has acquired in Buddhist monasticism a validity and significance which cannot easily be underrated.

CHAPTER VII

The Discipline and Development of the Mind

In spite of the diversity of opinion regarding the importance of the Catupārisuddhisīla one would readily admit that Buddhism attaches great importance to the inner development of the disciple as a part of his religious life. In its basic form this development would amount to the elimination of *manoduccarita* or evil traits of the mind and the cultivation of *manosucarita* as its opposite. This obviously lay outside the pale of *sīla*, for greed, hatred and wrong views (*abhijjhā vyāpāda micchādītthi*), the three items of *dasakammapatha*¹ which belong to the mind-group (*manokamma*) are not reckoned with under the *sīla*. The Suttas, on the other hand, repeatedly bring before us hosts of such vices or diseased states of the mind against which the disciples are constantly cautioned (*Evam eva kho bhikkhave citte saṃkiliṭṭhe duggati pāṭikarikhā*. M.I.36). The Vatthūpama Sutta gives a list of sixteen such evil traits of the mind which are referred to as *cittassa upakkilesā*.² None of these have been

¹ Dasakammapatha are the ten modes of acting classified under thought (3), word (4) and deed (3).

² M.I.36.

Chapter VII - The Discipline and Development of the Mind

brought up for correction under the category of *sīla*. Commenting on these, Buddhaghosa hastens to add that these sixteen are not the only defiling traits of the mind (*kilesa, upakkilesa*) and suggests that in this manner all *kilesa* are taken into consideration. (*Na ca ete soḷas'eva cittassa upakkilesā. Etena pana nayena sabbe'pi kilesā gahitā y'eva hontī'ti veditabbā* - MA.I.170).

The monks are advised to purge their minds of these as a step forward in their spiritual progress. (*Yath'odhi kho pana'ssa cattam hoti vantam muttam pahīnam paṇinissaṭṭham so buddhe aveccappasādena samannāgato'mhīti labhati atthavedam labhati dhammavedam labhati dhammūpasamhitam pāmujjam. Pamuditassa pīti jāyati pītimanassa kāyo passambhati passaddhakāyo sukham vedeti sukhino cittam samādhīyati.* M.I.37) The Sallekha Sutta which is addressed to the monks as a plea for self-correction introduces us to a much larger list of forty-four evil ways or akusala dhamma. The Buddha reminds his disciples that every attempt to eradicate these by a sincere desire to cultivate their opposites is a commendable virtue (*Cittuppādam'pi kho aham cunda kusalesu dhammesu bahukāram vadāmi. Ko pana vādo kāyena vācāya anuvidhīyanāsu. Tasmāt'iha cunda pare vihiṃsakā bhavissanti mayam'ettha avihīmsakā bhavissaāmā'ti cittam uppādetabbam.* M.I.43). He calls this the way to peace and progress:

uparibhāvapariyāya and nibbānapariyāya. (*Seyyathā'pi cunda ye keci akusalā dhammā sabbe te adbhobhāvaṅgamanīyā ye keci kusalā dhammā sabbe te uparibhāvaṅgamanīyā. Evaṃ eva kho cunda vihiṃsakassa purisapuggalassa avihimsā hoti uparibhāvāya..... Evaṃ eva kho cunda vihiṃsakassa purisapuggalassa avihimsā hoti parinibbānāya.* M.I.44).

The mental purge referred to above was always considered an essential feature in the religious life of a Buddhist disciple. The Suttas which deal with *sīla* as the basis of the spiritual development of a disciple refer to this as the subsequent cleansing of the mind of the *nīvaraṇa*. *Nīvaraṇa* defile and disease the mind and thereby weaken the functioning of the intellect. (*So ime pañca nīvaraṇe pahāya cetaso upakkilese paññāya dubbalīkaraṇe... M.I.412.*)¹ Thus the proper culture of the mind is a stage which must necessarily precede the perfection of wisdom or *adhipaññā sikkhā*. Without it, the mind can never be channelled for the attainment of Arahantship (*Evaṃ eva kho bhikkhave pañc'ime cittassa upakkilesā yehi upakkilesehi upakkilīṭṭhaṃ cittaṃ na c'eva mudu hoti no ca kammaniyaṃ na ca pabhassaraṃ pabhaṅgu ca na ca sammā samādhīyati āsavānaṃ khayāya. Katame pañca. Kāmacchando*

¹ See also M.I.521; II.226.

bhikkhave.... khayāya-S.V.92). Every good disciple, therefore, was expected to strive for the elimination of these defilements.

*Tatrā'bhiraṭṭiṃ iccheyya hitvā kāme akiñcano
pariyodapeyya attānaṃ cittaṅkalesehi paṇḍito.
S.V.24.*

The Khaggavisāṇa Sutta specifies the defiling mental traits as *cetaso āvaraṇa*, *upakkilesa* and *sinehadosa*:

*Pahāya pañcāvaraṇāni cetaso
upakkilese vyapanujja sabbe
anissito chetvā sinehadosaṃ
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo. Sn.v.66*

On a careful analysis of these defilements which are referred to as *nīvaraṇa*,¹ *cetaso āvaraṇa*,² *cittaklesa*,³ *upakkilesa*⁴ or *saṃyojana*,⁵ we discover that there are two constant and recurring items, viz. *abhijjhā* and *vyāpāda*. As a *nīvaraṇa*, *abhijjhā* is also referred to as *kāmacchanda*.⁶ As a *saṃyojana*, it

¹ M.I.60, 144, 412.

² Sn.v.66.

³ S.V.24.

⁴ M.I.36; S.V.92, 94, 108; Sn.v.66.

⁵ M.I.361; III.275.

⁶ See D.I. 1 and 246.

goes under both names of *kāmacchanda* and *kāmarāga*.¹ Thus it appears that in the mind-culture which is recommended to the Buddhist disciple, these two, out of the numerous evil states to which the mind was liable to descend, became the central target of attack. But we have already noted above that these two, together with *micchādīṭṭhi*, form the triad of *manokamma* in the list of *dasa akusala kamma*.² Hence we may ask ourselves why then do *abhijjhā* and *vyāpāda* come to be specially stressed, almost to the exclusion of *micchādīṭṭhi*. But it should also be noted here that *micchādīṭṭhi* is not listed under the *pañca nīvaraṇa* which are the primary defiling traits of the mind.³ Nor does the Vatthūpama Sutta mention it among the *upakkilesa* of the mind.⁴

This special mention of *abhijjhā* and *vyāpāda* has also a parallel when we consider *lobha (rāga)* and *dosa* which are referred to at times without any mention of *moha* which is the third item of the group. The Saṃyutta speaks of a disciple's conquest of these two evils:

¹ M.I.433.

² Ibid.47.

³ D. I.71. The *pañca nīvaraṇa* are *abhijjhā (kāmacchanda)*, *vyāpāda*, *thīnamiddha*, *uddhaccakukkucca* and *vicikicchā*.

⁴ M.I.36.

*Evaṃ mano chassu yadā subhāvito
phuṭṭhassa cittaṃ na vikampate kvaci
te rāgadose abhibhuyya bhikkhavo
bhavattha jātimaraṇassa pāragā'ti. S.IV.71.*

The Majjhima Nikāya mentions lobha and dosa as the two evils which are to be transcended by pursuing the Middle Path (*Tatr'āvuso lobho ca pāpako doso ca pāpako. Lobhassa ca pahānāya dosassa ca pahānāya atthi majjhimā paṭipadā cakkhukaraṇī ñāṇakaraṇī upasamāya abhiññāya sambodhāya nibbānāya saṃvattati.* M.I.15). However, it must be clearly borne in mind that in the final attainment of Arahantship there is no room for any trace of moha or of rāga and dosa. For nibbāna is the elimination of all the three evils of rāga, dosa and moha (*Yo kho āvuso rāgakkhayo dosakkhayo mohakkhayo idaṃ vuccati nibbānan'ti.* S.IV.251).

It is important to note that in this line of spiritual development *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* is regarded as one of the earlier mental failings which need to be remedied. For already at the early stage of Sotāpatti the first three *saṃyojana* (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi* together with *vicikicchā* and *sīlabbataparāmāsa*) are completely eradicated (*Tinnaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ parikkhayā sotāpanno avinipātadhammo niyato sambodhiparāyano'ti.* M.I.141). This achievement is further described as follows:

*Sahā'vassadassanasampadāya
taya'ssu dhammā jahitā bhavanti
sakkāyadiṭṭhi vicikicchitañ ca
sīlabbataṃ vā'pi yad'atthi kiñci. Sn.v.231.*

Beyond this, the further achievements of a Sakadāgāmin are only a reduction in rāga, dosa and moha (*yesaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ tīni saṃyojanāni pahīnānī rāgadosamohā tanubhūtā sabbe te sakadāgāmino sakid'eva imaṃ lokaṃ āgantvā dukkhass'antaṃ karissanti* - M.I.141). This makes it clear that in spite of the complete elimination of sakkāyadiṭṭhi at the stage of Sotāpatti, moha seems to survive beyond this. Even at the stage of Sakadāgāmin rāga, dosa and moha are only reduced in magnitude. An Anāgāmin is said to get rid of two more saṃyojana, viz. kāmacchanda and vyāpāda, for he is described as having purged himself by then of the five orambhāgiya saṃyojana.¹ If we regard the two saṃyojana, kāmacchanda and vyāpāda as approximating to rāga and dosa,² then we discern

¹ M.I.141,465. The five *orambhāgiya saṃyojana* are *sakkāyadiṭṭhi*, *vicikicchā*, *sīlabbataparāmāsa*, *kāmacchanda* and *vyāpāda*.

² Note: As a *saṃyojana*, only one aspect of *rāga*, viz. *kāmarāga* (*kāmacchanda*) seems to be eliminated at the stage of Anāgāmin. Even under the *uddhambhāgiya saṃyojana* an aspect of *rāga* seems

this reduced element of moha as surviving even after the stage of Anāgāmin. The final extinction of moha (mohakkhaya) perhaps takes place in Arahantship, after the elimination of the five uddhambhāgiya saṃyojana.¹ We find avijjā persisting as the last item of this group, and whatever meaning we may give to the term avijjā, it must undoubtedly remain a form of moha. Buddhaghosa's definition of moha that it is the root of all evil (*Moho... sabbā'kusalānaṃ mūlan'ti daṭṭhabbo*. Vism.468) perhaps emphasises this most enduring character of moha. This failing, which seems to find expression severally as micchādiṭṭhi, sakkāyadiṭṭhi, moha and avijjā, implies error of judgement and deficiency of knowledge, presumably of varying degree, which can be rectified completely only on the attainment of perfect wisdom in Arahantship.

The other defiling traits of the mind which the Suttas enumerate are mainly related to fraud, pride, jealousy and anger, which may exist in varying degrees of severity. Besides their moral and ethical significance for the religious life referred

to linger on under the names of *rūparāga* and *arūparāga*. It is also sometimes referred to as *bhavarāga*.

¹ The five *uddhambhāgiya saṃyojana* consist of *rūparāga*, *arūparāga*, *māna*, *uddhacca* and *avijjā*.

to in the Vatthūpama¹ and Sallekha² Suttas, they also have an essentially social character in that these failings cause friction and disharmony in the communal life of the monastic society. The Anumāna Sutta calls them the *dovacassa-karaṇa-dhamma*, or evil ways of monks which make them resent and reject good counsel from fellow members. The Saṅgha would no longer trust such monks and would deem it unwise to advise or admonish them (*So ca hoti dubbaco dovacassa-karaṇehi dhammehi samannāgato akkhamo appadakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsaniṃ. Atha kho naṃ sabrahmacārī na c'eva vattabbaṃ maññanti na ca anusāsitabbaṃ maññanti na ca tasmim puggale vissāsaṃ āpajjitabbaṃ maññanti. M.I.95*). Therefore the monks are called upon to view from all angles the dangers resulting from these to the religious life as well as to the life in the community, and make therefore every effort for their elimination. (i. *Sa kho so bhikkhave bhikkhu abhijjhāvisamalobho cittassa upakkilesa'ti iti viditvā abhijjhāvisamalobhaṃ cittassa upakkilesaṃ pajahati. ii. Pare abhijjhālū bhavissanti mayam ettha anabhijjhālū bhavissāmā'ti sallekho karaṇīyo. iii. Tatrāvuso bhikkhunā attanā'va attānaṃ evam anuminitabbaṃ yo khv'āyaṃ puggalo pāpiccho*

¹ M.I.37

² Ibid.42

*pāpikānaṃ icchānaṃ vasaṃgato ayam me puggalo appiyo amanāpo. Ahañ c'eva kho pan'assaṃ pāpiccho pāpikānaṃ icchānaṃ vasaṃgato aham'p'assaṃ paresaṃ appiyo amanāpo'ti. Evaṃ jānanta āvuso bhikkhunā na pāpiccho bhaviṣṣāmi na pāpikānaṃ icchānaṃ vasaṃgato'ti cittaṃ uppādetabbaṃ. M.I.37)*¹

It appears to be fairly clear from the statements in the Suttas that for the cultivation of the perfect character it was not only a life of renunciation that was desirable. The *pabbajita*, as a disciple who had given up all household ties, was further advised that solitary retreats would be conducive to a life of contemplation and spiritual perfection. We discover in the Suttas that it was nothing unusual for the early Buddhist disciple to resort to a sylvan retreat in order to develop his inner character (*So iminā ca ariyena sīlakkhandhena samannāgato...santutthiyā samannāgato vivittaṃ senāsaṇaṃ bhajati araññaṃ rukkhamaṇaṃ pabbataṃ kandaraṃ giriguhaṃ susānaṃ vanapatthaṃ abbhokāsaṃ palālapuñjaṃ. So pacchābhattaṃ piṇḍapapaṭikkanto nisīdati pallaṅkaṃ ābhujitvā ujum kāyaṃ paṇidhāya parimukhaṃ satim upatthapetvā. D.I.71*). The Buddha, in fact, recognises the existence among his disciples of monks who lead such lives (*Santi kho pana me*

¹ Also M.I.42, 97

udāyi sāvakā āraññakā pantasenāsanā araññavanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni ajjhogahetvā viharanti. M. II. 8). This mode of life of some of the early Buddhist monks seems also to have been well recognised as a regular institution as is evident from words ascribed to Vessavaṇa in the Āṭānāṭiya Sutta (*Santi hi bhante bhagavato sāvakā araññe vanapatthāni pantāni sensanāni paṭisevanti appasaddāni appanigghosāni vijanavātāni manussarāhaseyyakāni paṭsallānasāruppāni.* D.III.195). In the Saṃyutta Nikāya we hear of the venerable Udāyi who reports back to the Buddha the progress he made under such conditions (*So khv'āham bhante suññāgāragato imesam pañcupādānakkhandhānaṃ ukkujjāvakujaṃ samparivattento idaṃ dukkhan'ti yathābhūtam abbhaññāsim,* S.V.89). At times the Buddha is seen making direct reference to this in his admonitions to his disciples. 'Resort to the solitary retreats and be engaged in contemplative thought,' he tells Cunda, and adds further, 'Be quick and zealous, lest you repent afterwards.' (*Yaṃ kho cunda satthārā karaṇīyaṃ sāvakānaṃ hitesinā anukampakena anukampaṃ upādāya kataṃ vo tam mayā. Etāni cunda rukkhamūlāni etāni suññāgārāni. Jhāyatha cunda mā pamāda'ttha mā pacchā vippaṭisārino ahuvattha. Ayaṃ vo amhākaṃ anusāsanti.* M.I.46). He is seen advising

Ānanda with these same words.¹ The Buddha is even more direct in his admonitions to Nanda who evinced a love of luxury and pleasure (*Evaṃ kho te nanda patirūpaṃ kulaputtassa saddhā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitassa yaṃ tvaṃ āraññako assasi piṇḍapātiko ca paṃsukūliko ca. Kāmesu ca anapekkho vihareyyāsīti.* S.II.281). Here the relevance of his remarks appears in clearer relief, for the very things that he seems to recommend to Nanda are some of those of which he refused Devadatta to make a general rule incumbent on all.²

It is evident that this mode of living, which is called a life of physical detachment or *kāyavūpakaṭṭha*,³ soon came to be recognised in Buddhist monastic circles as a much praised virtue (*Etha tumhe āraññakā hotha araññavanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni paṭisevathā'ti. Iti kāyavūpakaṭṭhe samādapetabbā nivesetabbā patitṭhāpetabbā.* A.III.138). The Pali texts make repeated attempts to show that both the Buddha and the venerable Mahā Kassapa practised this way of solitary living. They are said to have done so for their own comfort and peace of mind as well as for the purpose of setting a good example for the future generations. King Pasenadi Kosala praises the

¹ M.II.266; III.302; S.V.157.

² Vin.III.171.

³ A.III.138.

Buddha for this special virtue (*Yam pi bhante bhagavā dīgharattam āraññako araññavanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni paṭisevati imaṃ pi kho ahaṃ bhante atthavasam sampassamāno bhagavati evarūpaṃ paramanipaccākāraṃ karomi mittūpahāraṃ upadaṃsemi.* A.V.66f.). Saṃyutta Nikāya informs us of Kassapa's preference for this mode of life (*Kim pana tvaṃ kassapa atthavasam sampassamāno dīgharattam āraññako c'eva araññakattassa vaṇṇavādī.* S.II.203f.). This is in fact made out to be the general pattern of conduct of the Buddha and his disciples. (*Ye kira te ahesuṃ buddhānubuddhasāvaka te dīgharattam āraññakā c'eva ahesuṃ araṇṇakattassa ca vaṇṇavādino.* Ibid.). Udumbarikasīhanāda Sutta goes so far as to make it an ancient and eternal order which governs the life of the Buddhas of the past, present and the future (*Ye te ahesuṃ atītaṃ addhānaṃ arahanto sammāsambuddhā.... evaṃ su te bhagavanto araññe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni paṭisevanti appasaddāni appanigghosāni vijanavātāni manussarāhaseyyakāni paṭisallānasārubbāni seyyathā'pi bhagavā etarahīti.* D.III.54). The Aṅguttara Nikāya which gives five different reasons for the adoption of this way of forest-living says that one would take to it being impressed by the fact that it had been extolled by the Buddha and his disciples (*vaṇṇitaṃ buddhehi buddhasāvakehīti āraññako hoti.* A.III.219). But the real reason,

it goes on to add, should be that it provides an ideal setting to the man who has renounced the cares of the world and seeks to perfect his inner being (*Appicchataṃ y'eva nissāya santuṭṭhiṃ y'eva nissāya sallekhatam y'eva nissāya pavivekaṃ y'eva nissāya idaṃ atthitaṃ y'eva nissāya āraññako hoti*. Ibid.).

It appears from the above consideration that every attempt had been made to popularise this mode of life as the one that contributes most to the spiritual well-being of the disciple. It was deemed useful for the progress of both samatha and vipassanā. It is this idea of solitary and secluded life that is implied in the phrase *brūhetā suññāgārānaṃ* which the Buddha addresses as an admonition to his disciples.¹ The *Papañcasūdanī* brings both *samatha* and *vipassanā* within the aspirations of this solitary life in its comment on *brūhetā suññāgārānaṃ* (*Ettha ca samathavipassanāvasena kammaṭṭhānaṃ gahetvā rattindivaṃ suññāgāraṃ pavisitvā nisīdamāno bhikkhū brūhetā suññāgārānaṃ'ti veditabbo*. MA.I.157). This love of the life of solitude in the forest is one of the seven conditions which would arrest the decay of the monk (*satta aparihāniyā dhammā*). It would, on the other hand, be a stimulus to his spiritual progress (*Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū āraññakesu senāsanesu sāpekkhā bhavissanti vuddhi y'eva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ*

¹ M.I.33; A.V.131.

*pāṭikaṅkhā no parihāni. D.II.77)¹ It is also given as one of ten items which a disciple should constantly ponder over with a view to developing a love for it (*Kacci no ahaṃ sūñṇāgāre abhiraṃāmiṭṭi pabbajitena abhiṇhaṃ paccavekkhitabbā.... me kho bhikkhave dasa dhammā pabbajitena abhiṇhaṃ paccavekkhitabbā. A.V.88*).*

However, it was recognised at the same time that mere residence in forest retreats or adopting frugal and abstemious ways of life was not a virtue in itself, unless accompanied by a corresponding perfection of character. The Buddha tells the venerable Sandha that unless the defiling traits of the mind are first eliminated they would overpower him even as he dwells in his forest residence and lead him astray in his musings (*Evam eva kho sandha idh'ekacco purisakhaluṅko araṇṇāgato'pi rukkhamaḷagato'pi suñṇāgāragato'pi kāmarāgapariyuṭṭhitena cetasā viharati kāmarāgaparetena. Uppannassa ca kāmarāgassa nissaraṇaṃ yathābhūtaṃ nappajānāti. So kāmarāgaṃ ... vicikicchaṃ y'eva antaraṃ karitvā jhāyati pajjhāyati nijjhāyati avajjhāyati. A.V.323*).

On the other hand, it has been very realistically pointed out that unless a disciple makes progress towards the attainment of

¹ Also A.IV.21.

the tranquility of mind which he is seeking, it would be difficult for him to relish forest-residence and delight in its solitude. The wilderness would whirl away his mind. In the Bhayabherava Sutta, the Brahmin Jānussoni expresses this view and the Buddha is found to be in perfect agreement with him (*Durabhisambhavāni hi bho gotama araññe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni. Dukkaraṃ pavivekaṃ durabhiramaṃ ekatte. Haranti maññe mano vanāni samādhiṃ alabhamānassa.* M.I.16).¹ In the early history of the Sāsana it was evidently this dread of forest-residence which prevented it from being widely accepted. The story of the Verañjābhānavāra seems to indicate that the reliance on this mode of life alone, without an alternative, was regarded as one of the causes that led to the alleged breakdown of the monastic institutions of some of the Buddhas of the past.² Thus it is not difficult to see that while zealous monks like Mahā Kassapa and Upasena Vaṅgantaputta were regular forest-dwellers and always spoke in favour of it, there were, even in the earliest days of the Sāsana, others who probed into the spiritual qualifications of those who resorted to such a way of life and pointed out that it could be as much a source of danger to a monk as a life of

¹ See also A.V.202.

² Vin. III. 8.

pleasure. Continuing to lead such a life without attaining the desired result of tranquility of the mind, it is pointed out, would lead a disciple to disastrous consequences (*Yo kho upāli evaṃ vadeyya ahaṃ samādhim alabhamāno araññe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni paṭisevissāmīti tass'etaṃ pāṭikankhaṃ saṃsīdissati vā uppilavissati vā*. A.V.202). The commentary explains that in such a state of contradiction the mind of the disciple would be torn by thoughts of lust or hatred (*Saṃsīdissatīti kāmavitakkehi saṃsīdissati uppilavissatīti vyāpādavihimsāvītakkehi uddhaṃ pilavissati* - AA.V.67).

But those who took to this way of life supported it wholeheartedly. Mahā Kassapa led the way in this direction, both by example and precept (*Dve kho ahaṃ bhante atthavasam sampassamāno dīgharattaṃ āraññako c'eva araññakattassa ca vaṇṇavādī... Attano ca diṭṭhadhammasukhavihāraṃ sampassamāno pacchimañ ca janataṃ anukampamāno app'eva nāma pacchimā janatā diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjeyyūṃ*. S.II.202). Upasena Vaṅgantaputta was such an ardent supporter of it that he would take none as his pupil unless he was willing to be a regular forest-dweller (*Yo maṃ bhante upasampadam yācati t'āhaṃ evaṃ vadāmi ahaṃ kho āvuso āraññako piṇḍapātiko paṃsukūliko. Sace tvaṃpi āraññako bhavissasi piṇḍapātiko paṃsukūliko ev'āhaṃ taṃ upasampādessāmīti*. Vin.III.230). However, even during the life-

time of the Buddha we note that the *araññakatta* as a regular mode of monastic life was recommended with certain reservations. According to a statement in the Anguttara Nikāya, the venerable Upāli informs the Buddha of his desire to live the forest-life (*Ekamantaṃ nisinno kho āyasmā upāli bhagavantaṃ etad avoca icchāma'haṃ bhante araññe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni paṭisevitun'ti. A.V.202*). But he was immediately dissuaded by the Buddha who, in those same words of Jānussoni quoted earlier, told him of the hopelessness of forest-life for one who fails to gain tranquility of the mind.

It is somewhat difficult to understand here why Upāli, who later became such a distinguished disciple, was warned by the Buddha in this manner. We are thus inclined to ask whether these remarks implied any inherent weakness of Upāli against which the Buddha was anxious to safeguard him. The next remark which the Buddha makes, dismissing almost with ridicule the idea that one could still continue to lead the forest-life without gaining any tranquility of mind, seems to be very emphatic about Upāli's inaptitude for such a life. The words with which the Buddha concludes his advice to Upāli crown the whole argument. 'Stay back, Upāli, in the midst of the Saṅgha and it will contribute to your own welfare.' (*Irigha tvaṃ upāli saṅghe viharāhi saṅghe te viharato phāsu bhavissati. A.V.209*). The Commentary very readily solves this problem by pointing

out that if Upāli was allowed to choose the way of forest-life, he would have only developed the holy life and missed the chance of learning the texts of the Vinaya. He would also thereby have lost the honour of being the chief exponent of the Vinaya. The Commentary says that it was in anticipation of the situation that the Buddha advised him against retiring to the forest. However, it is clear that what the text tries to stress is something different.

We do not propose to probe further into this matter here. But the Bhayabherava Sutta and the story of Upāli in the Aṅguttara Nikāya yield us two interesting observations. In the Bhayabherava Sutta, the Buddha who was told by Jānussoṇi of the difficulties of forest-life explains that the disciple who on retiring to the forest assails the evil and corrupt ways of his life, gains with each victory greater and greater confidence for the pursuit of it. It is in terms of his own life as the Bodhisatta that the Buddha makes these observations in the Bhayabherava Sutta (*Etam aham brāhmaṇa parisuddha-kammantaṃ attani sampassamāno bhiyyo pallomaṃ āpādiṃ arañṇe vihārāya*. M.I.17). On the other hand, it is pointed out that to retire to the forest one did not need to wait for the perfection of his spiritual life. In fact, it was to achieve this end that one took to the forest life. But the forest-dweller had to be continually inspired by his religious aspirations, i.e. the higher and higher states of spiritual development he could attain in succession (*Imaṃ'pi kho upāli*

*mama sāvakā attanā dhammaṃ samanupassamānā araññe
vanapaṭṭhāni paṭṭhāni senāsanāni paṭisevanti no ca kho tāva
anupattasatthā viharanti. A.V.207).*

Once this spiritual earnestness was secured the results of forest-residence always proved to be heartening and the hardships of such a life recede to the background. Thus the thera Vakkali who was living in the forest, even though he suffered from cramps (*vātarogābhiniṭo*), made his mind triumph over the body and thereby propelled himself to further and further spiritual attainments, ignoring the hardships of forest life.

*Pītisukhena vipulena pharamāno samussayaṃ
lūkham'pi abhisambhonto viharissāmi kānane.
Bhāvento satipaṭṭhāne indriyāni balāni ca
bojjhaṅgāni ca bhāvento viharissāmi kānane.*

Thag.vv.351-2

With bliss and rapture's flooding wave
This mortal frame will I suffuse.
Though hard and rough what I endure
Yet will I in the jungle dwell.

Herein myself I 'll exercise:
The Starting-points of Mindfulness,
The Powers five, the Forces too,

The Factors of Enlightenment --

So will I in the jungle dwell.

Psalms of the Brethren, vv.351-2

A similar story is told of the thera Nhātakamuni.¹ The thera Ekavihāriya seems to look upon the wilderness as the one place of delight to the ardent disciple, the yogī.

*Purato pacchato vā'pi aparō ce na vijjati
atīva phāsu bhavati ekassa vasato vane.
Handa eko gamissāmi araññaṃ buddhavaṇṇitaṃ
phāsuṃ ekavihārissa pahitattassa bhikkhuno.
Yogapītikaraṃ rammaṃ mattakuñjarasevitaṃ
eko atthavasī khippaṃ pavisissāmi kānanaṃ.*

Thag.vv.537-9

If there be none in front, nor none behind
Be found, is one alone and in the woods
Exceeding pleasant doth his life become.

Come then! alone I 'll get me hence and go
To lead the forest-life the Buddha praised,

¹ Thag.vv.436-7

And taste the welfare which the brother knows,
Who dwells alone with concentrated mind.

Yea, swiftly and alone, bound to my quest,
I 'll to the jungle that I love, the haunt
Of wanton elephants, the source and means
Of thrilling zest to each ascetic soul.

Psalms of the Brethren, vv.537-9

Therein he looks forward to the consummation of his religious life.

*Ekākiyo adutiyo ramanīye mahāvane
kadā'ham viharissāmi katakicco anāsavo.*

Thag. v. 541

Lone and unmated in the lovely woods,
When shall I come to rest, work wrought, heart
cleansed?

Psalms of the Brethren, v.541

Armed for that purpose, he plunges into the forest, never to return until he has attained his heart's desire, the highest goal of Arahantship.

*Esa bandhāmi sannāhaṃ pavisissāmi kānaṃ
na tato nikkhamissāmi appatto āsavakkhayaṃ.*

Thag.v.543

I 'll bind my spirit's armour on, and so
The jungle will I enter, that from thence
I'll not come forth until Nibbāna's won.

Psalms of the Brethren,v.543

Perhaps the most glorious example of a thera who seems to have enjoyed every moment of his life in the forest, using these sylvan charms as a spring-board to higher spiritual attainments is the thera Tālapuṭa. To him, they have been a constant source of inspiration as he pursued this spiritual quest.

*Kadā nu maṃ pāvusakālamegho
navena toyena sacīvaraṃ vane
isippayātamhi vane vajantaṃ
ovassate taṃ nu kadā bhavissati.
Kadā mayūrassa sikhaṇḍino vane
dijassa sutvā girigabbhare rutaṃ
paccuṭṭhahitvā amatassa pattiyā
samcintaye taṃ nu kadā bhavissati.*

Thag.vv.1102-3

O when will (break above my head)
The purple storm- cloud of the rains,

And with fresh torrents drench my raiment in the woods,
Wherein I wend my way.

Along the Path the Seers have trod before -

Yea, when shall this thing come to be?

O when shall I, hearing the call adown the woods

Of crested, twice- born peacock (as I lie

At rest) within the bosom of the hill,

Arise and summon thought and will

To win th' Ambrosial -

Yes, when shall this come to be?

Psalms of the Brethren, vv. 1102-3

Similar ecstasies of the thera Tālapuṭa are also evident in the following verses ascribed to him:

*Varāhaṇeyyavigāḷhasevite
pabbhārakūṭe pakāṭe'va sundare
navambunā pāvusasittakānane
tahiṃ guhāgehagato ramissasi.*

*Sunīlagīvā susikhā supekhuṇā
sucittapattacchadanā vihaṃgamā
sumañjughosatthanitābhigajjino
te taṃ ramissantī vanamhi jhāyinaṃ.*

*Vuṭṭhamhi deve caturaṅgule tiṇe
sampupphite meghanibhamhi kānane
nagantare viṭapisamo sayissam
taṃ me mudu hohiti tūlasannibham.*

Thag.vv.1135-7

O (thou wilt love the life), be't on the crest
Of caverned cliffs, where herd boar and gazelle,
Or in fair open glade, or in the depths
Of forest freshened by new rain - 'tis there
Lies joy for thee to cavern-cottage gone.

Fair-plumed, fair-crested passengers of air
With deep blue throats and many-hued of wing,
Give greeting to the muttering thundercloud
With cries melodius, manifold; 'tis they
Will give thee joy whiles thou art musing there.

And when the god rains on the four-inch grass,
And on the cloud-like crests of budding woods,
Within the mountain's heart I 'll seated be
Immobile as a lopped-off bough, and soft
As cotton down my rocky couch shall seem.

Psalms of the Brethren,vv.1135-7

There seems to be very little reason to doubt that in the early days of the Sāsana when the majority of the Buddha's disciples chose the monastic life out of a deep-rooted conviction, realising its significance and its implications, the practice of frugality and contentment, and to some extent even austerity, was a reality in Buddhist monasticism. Following the *anagāriya* doctrine of the Buddha, the disciples could not have conducted themselves in any other way if they were to be true to their convictions. It was not a mere non-existent ideal of the past, as is assumed by some, that was used as the criterion in commenting on the increasing laxity in monastic discipline.¹ There was undoubtedly an established and recognised pattern of conduct which was jointly determined by both the Dhamma and the Vinaya in terms of which monastic conduct was judged and criticised.

It is clear from a passage in the Aṅguttara that it included perfection of personal character as well as observance of monastic propriety. Discussing the dangers that would befall the Sāsana in the future (*anāgatabhayāni*), it is said that monks of uncultivated character would confer higher monastic status on others whom they would not be able to instruct and discipline towards perfection of character on account of their own

¹ Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.199f.

imperfections. But these new members, inspite of their imperfect character, would in turn aspire to be leaders and teachers and thus subscribe to the continuous degeneration and corruption of monastic life (*Bhavissanti bhikkhave bhikkhū anāgatamaddhānaṃ abhāvitakāyā abhāvitasīlā abhāvitacittā abhāvitapaññā te abhāvitakāyā samānā abhāvitasīlā abhāvitacittā abhāvitapaññā aññe upasampādessanti. Te'pi na sakkhissanti vinetuṃ adhisīle adhicitte adhipaññāya. Te'pi bhavissanti abhāvitakāyā..... abhāvitapaññā. Iti kho bhikkhave dhammasandosā vinayasandosā vinayasandosā dhammasandosā. A.III.106*).

We have already noticed in our study of *sīla* that with the increase of offences and offenders in the monastic community rules and regulations for the guidance of its members became more rigorous and more comprehensive, and in the light of contemporary events, were made foolproof. This battle against falling standards and increasing laxity in monastic discipline led to a number of interesting developments. The simple and basic monastic virtues of contentment with regard to food, clothing and residence, and the love of solitude, which were more or less assumed to be basic virtues in the early days of the Sāsana, begin to acquire more and more importance. It becomes a compulsory monastic procedure that every monk, soon after the conferment of Upasampadā, be told of the four

Nissayas or the minimum of his requirements with which he is expected to be satisfied all his life.¹ They are: i. begged-food for a meal (*piṇḍiyālopabhojana*), ii. a robe made of bits of cloth collected from here and there for a garment (*paṃsukūlacīvara*), iii. residence at the foot of a tree (*rukhamūlasenāsana*), and iv. putrid urine as medicament (*pūtimuttābhesajja*). However, it was not binding on him to be confined within these narrow limits. If extra gifts were offered to him he was given the option to receive them. This principle of the Nissayas was laid down by the Buddha only as a safeguard against any possible complaints from monks regarding the scanty provision of food, clothing etc. by the laymen. It is a forewarning against disappointment and disillusionment concerning the comforts of monastic life.

However, it was the Buddha himself who refused the request alleged to have been made by Devadatta to make these virtues of simplicity compulsory for the monks.² But the public at large, who inherited the ascetic traditions of India, show a partiality for austerity and asceticism in religious life. Even during the life

¹ Vin.I.95f. This is the modified procedure. The original suggestion was that the Nissayas be made known before the conferment of Upasampadā. See Vin. I. 58. See *supra*. p.42.

² Vin.III.171.

time of the Buddha there seem to have been some who thought the monks who were austere and ascetic in their ways were, on that account, more worthy of honour and nearer to perfection. A householder of Nāḍika once told the Buddha that whenever he made offerings of food he always selected monks who were abstemious and austere in their ways (*Dīyati me bhante kule dānaṃ tañ ca kho ye te bhikkhū āraññakā piṇḍapātikā paṃsukūlikā arahanto vā arahattamaggaṃ vā samāpannā tathārūpesu bhante dānaṃ dīyyati*. A.III.391). Here, the Buddha hastens to correct the fallacy and states that susterity, without the perfection of character, would not be a virtue in itself. On the other hand, a monk who is less austere could be more worthy of honour on account of his perfect character (*Araññako ce'pi gahapati bhikkhu hoti uddhato unnalo capalo mukharo vikiṇṇavāco muṭṭhassati asampajāno asamāhito vibbhantacitto pākatindriyo evaṃ so tena y'eva gārayho... Gahapaticīvaradharo ce'pi gahapati bhikkhu hoti anuddhato anunnalo acapalo amukharo avikiṇṇavāco upaṭṭhitasati sampajāno samāhito ekaggacitto saṃvutindriyo evaṃ so tena y'eva pāsaṃso*. Ibid.). The existence among the popular values of the day of a preference for ascetic and austere living as a monastic virtue is indicated in a statement in the Anaṅgana Sutta. It is stated that the monk who lives in urban associations appears to suffer by contrast when placed against his forest-

dwelling brethren. The Sutta, however, makes it clear that according to true Buddhist values what mattered more in the perfection of monastic life was the elimination of defiling traits of the mind (*pāpakā akusalā icchāvacarā*).¹

We notice, at any rate, that along with the choice of this solitary way of life in the forest there seems to have gone hand in hand a number of other practices which reveal frugality, abstemiousness and contentment. The Anaṅgana Sutta mentions three such practices, viz. i. forest residence (*ārañṇaka*), ii. subsistence on begged food (*piṇḍa-pātika*) and iii. use of patch-work robe (*paṃsukūlika*).² These seem to cover a disciple's residence, food and clothing. In the form they are presented here they constitute special ways of monastic life which are optional. They do not bear any longer the general and simple character of the Nissayas. As monastic observances they seem to have brought greater honour and respect to those who practised them, presumably on account of the austerity and sacrifice they implied. It becomes more evident when we compare the opposites of these ways which seem to indicate, as it were, an easier way of life: *gāmantavihāra* or residence in the proximity of a village,

¹ M.I.30-31.

² M.I.30.

nemantanika or acceptance of invitations to meals and *gahapati-cīvaradhara* or use of garments offered by laymen.¹ To these monastic practices which were becoming increasingly popular, *tecīvarikatta* or reliance on a single set of three robes was sometimes added as a fourth.² The Buddha recognises, however, that there can be a nominal practice of these austere ways without any corresponding spiritual progress. He brings to our notice the thirty Pāveyyaka monks. who inspite of the complete adoption of these austere ways, were full of defiling traits of character (*Atha kho bhagavato etadahosi. Ime kho tiṃsamattā pāveyyakā bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe piṇḍapātikā sabbe paṃsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā sabbe sasamyojanā. Yannūnā'haṃ imesaṃ tathā dhammaṃ deseyyaṃ yathā nesaṃ imasmiṃ y'eva āsane anupādāya āsavehi cittāni vimucceyyun'ti. S.II.187*).

We also detect an attempt to idealise these practices and make them a part of the general pattern of Buddhist monastic life. This seems to herald the ascendancy of asceticism as the hallmark of monastic virtue. The Yodhājivavagga of the Aṅguttara Nikāya³ which gives warning of a number of

¹ Ibid.31.

² Ibid.214; S.II.187, 202.

³ A.III.108f.

calamities that would befall the Sāsana with the lapse of time (*anāgatabhayāni*), refers to the practice of these ways of monastic living as though it was the order of the day. Here we see clearly an attempt to fix and establish the changing pattern of monastic living in a form acceptable to contemporary values. We would not imagine that there was unanimity of opinion with regard to these values. However, it is certain that they were acceptable to a fair section of the community who were powerful enough to publicise and popularise their views among others. There will come a time, says the text, when monks evincing a love of luxury with regard to food, clothing and residence would neglect the present austere practices of being *piṇḍapātika*, *paṃsukūlika* and *āraññaka* respectively. They would give up the life of retirement in the forest and 'invading the urban districts' indulge in all manner of unworthy pursuits for the sake of their requisites (*Bhavissanti bhikkhave bhikkhū anāgatamaddhānaṃ cīvare kalyānakāmā te cīvare kalyānakāmā samānā riñcissanti paṃsukūlikattaṃ riñcissanti araññavanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni gāmanigama-rājadhāniṃ osarivā vāsaṃ kappessanti cīvarahetu ca anekavihitāṃ anesanaṃ appaṭirūpaṃ āpajjissanti. Idaṃ bhikkhave paṭhamāṃ anāgatabhayaṃ etarahi asamuppannaṃ āyatim samuppajjissati. Taṃ vo paṭibujjhitabbaṃ paṭibujjhitvā ca tassa pahānāya vāyamiṭtabbaṃ. A.III.108f.*).

Chapter VII - The Discipline and Development of the Mind

In a similar passage in the Saṃyutta,¹ the Buddha, in a conversation with the venerable Mahā Kassapa, is made to lament over this alleged decline in Buddhist monastic values and the effect it would have on the younger generation of disciples. Nevertheless, this tendency appears to have continued unabated. Those who fought for laxity in discipline were equally vivacious and vociferous and are seen thrusting themselves against the orthodoxy with unyielding persistence.²

¹ S.II.208f.

² M.I.438, 440f, 473; A.I.230.

CHAPTER VIII
The Codified Law of the Saṅgha

The first indications of the evolution of a system of codified law for the Saṅgha come to us with the promulgation of *sikkhāpada* which was provoked by laxities in discipline in the monastic community which contravened the spirit of *sīla*. The *sikkhāpada* thus laid down from time to time soon grew to be a comprehensive code of discipline for the monks and was put into effective functioning through the fortnightly recital which was called the Uddesa or Pātimokkhuddesa.¹ The Aṅguttara Nikāya specifies the total number of *sikkhāpada* which were thus regularly recited to be over a hundred and fifty (*Sādhikam idam bhante diyadḍha-sikkhāpada-satam anvaddhamāsam uddesam āgacchati*. A.I.230). This is evidently an early reckoning, for the extant code of the Pātimokkha (for the Bhikkhus) has a total of 220 *sikkhāpada*.² Seven different groups of *sikkhāpada* contribute to this total of 220. The distribution of the *sikkhāpada* is as follows: Pārājika 4, Saṅghādisesa 13, Aniyata 2, Nissaggiya 30, Pācittiya 92,

¹ A.I.230. See Chapter IX on the Ritual of the Pātimokkha.

² See *infra* p.370.

Pātiesaniya 4, Sekhiya 75. The Adhikaranasamathas which are seven in number, being differentiated *dhammā* for obvious reasons, cannot be grouped together along with these *sikkhāpada*.

It is clear from the evidence of both the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas that the promulgation of the *sikkhāpada* preceded the institution of the fortnightly recital of the Pātimokkha for the monks. This does not, however, preclude the possibility that additions were made to the corpus of *sikkhāpada* even after the institution of the Pātimokkha recital.¹ But we discover Oldenberg has expressed a surprisingly different view. He says: "The origin of the earliest rules or laws laid down by the Buddhist community for the guidance of its members appears to have been connected with those assemblies of Bhikkhus which met at full and new moon."² We fail to see why Oldenberg adopted this sequence in relating the *sikkhāpada* to the Pātimokkha recital. According to what we have been able to gather from the evidence of the Suttas and the Vinaya this appears to be a reversal of the order. We ourselves observe that some of the rules of the Pātimokkha have had their origin

¹ Pāc.72 and 73 presuppose the existence of the Pātimokkha recital. See Vin.IV.143f.

² Vin.I.p.xv.

after the recital of the Pātimokkha had acquired definite form and recognition. At the same time it appears to be reasonable to assume that a large number of rules would have had their origin independent of the idea of a recital.

The promulgation of rules in the form of *sikkhāpada* was necessitated by the growing inadequacy of the moral injunctions of *sīla* to curb miscreants. Perhaps the form in which the rules of the Pātimokkha are introduced in the Suttavibhaṅga led Oldenberg to his conclusion. The Suttavibhaṅga introduces every rule saying 'This rule shall be recited in this manner': *Evañ ca pana bhikkhave imam sikkhāpadam uddiseyyātha*. The editors of the Suttavibhaṅga, we may venture to guess, could not have thought of the *sikkhāpada* divorced from the Uddesa or the recital at the Uposatha. Thus it is said of all the *sikkhāpada*, from the first to the last, that they should be recited in this form.¹ But we cannot infer from this that the entire code of the Pātimokkha was drawn up, like a constitution, prompted solely by the needs of the recital. We believe Oldenberg is much nearer the truth when he says the following: "A list of those offences which deserved punishment or some kind of expiation was, at a very early period, drawn up for the use of

¹ Vin.III.21; IV.185.

these confessional meetings."¹ Rhys Davids and Oldenberg jointly express the same idea elsewhere: "A list was drawn up which of course it would be necessary from time to time to complete and rectify -- of those offences which ought to be confessed and atoned for....."² This certainly was, in the first instance, a systematic grouping together of material which was already in existence.

In the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya Piṭaka, which gives the most comprehensive account of the origin and development of the ritual of the Pātimokkha, the Buddha says that he would sanction for recital at the ritual of the Pātimokkha the *sikkhāpada* which he has already laid down for the monks (*Yannūnāham yāni mayā bhikkhūnam paññattāni sikkhāpadāni tāni nesam pātimokkhuddesam anujāneyyam. So nesam bhavissati uposathakamman'ti. Vin.I.102*). The Vimativinodanī □Ṭikā, a Sub-Commentary on the Samantapāsādikā, which explains further the evolution of the Pātimokkha code adds that the Buddha himself gave to the *sikkhāpada* which he had laid down a formal character by codifying them and prefacing them with an introduction for the purpose of recital at the Uposatha meeting (*Pubbe avijjamānam paññāpesī'ti na kevalañ ca etam.*

¹ Vin.I.p.xv.

² *Vinaya Texts I* [SBE.XIII], p.xi.

*Pubbe paññattam'pi pana pārājikādi sikkhāpadam sabbam bhagavā tatr'ime cattāro pārājikā dhammā uddesam āgacchantī'ti ādinā pārājikuddesādivasena vinayamātikam katvā nidān'uddesena saha sayam eva sangahetvā pātimokkhan'ti paññāpesī'ti daṭṭhabbam. Vimt.396).*¹

We should draw attention here to the fact that Sukumar Dutt refers to the above account of the Mahāvagga as 'the legend, incredible for obvious reasons...'² As far as we can see the incredibility of the legend is not so obvious. But it is abundantly clear that this account, together with other allied evidence, contradicts his thesis regarding the Pātimokkha. Fact or fiction he may call this, it will be seen that there is adequate evidence both in the Suttas and in the Vinaya which support this tradition that

- (i) the promulgation of the *sikkhāpada*, not necessarily all, started with the Buddha. (See M.I.444f; A.I.230f.).

¹ Whether one holds the Commentarial tradition in high esteem or not, one cannot fail to be impressed here by the fact that this interpretation seems to be more than adequately supported by the evidence of the Canonical texts.

² S.Dutt, *Buddha and five After-Centuries*, p.77.

(ii) the recital of the Pātimokkha was instituted during the life time of the Buddha and under his personal direction. (See M.II.8, III.10; A.I.230).

(iii) the *sikkhāpada* which had been promulgated earlier formed the text of the Uddesa or the recital. (See Vin.I.102; A.I.230).

We notice that a comprehensive code of *sikkhāpada* was in existence in the monastic circles at an early date¹ and that it was regularly recited before the Saṅgha once a fortnight,² with a view to reminding and acquainting the disciples with the regulations in terms of which they were expected to discipline themselves.³ The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya in the Chinese version asserts negatively this function of the recital when it says that owing to the repeated recitals of abridged texts of the Pātimokkha the young monks failed to acquaint themselves with its contents.⁴

Each one of these *sikkhāpada* or rules which constitute the text of the Pātimokkha, according to the text of the Vinaya

¹ Vin.III.178.

² M.III.10; A.1.230; Vin.IV.144.

³ Vin.IV.144.

⁴ *Taisho*, Vol.22.p.127 B.

Piṭaka, was laid down on the commission of some offence which thereafter on the authority of the rules thus laid down, was declared illegal. These rules, as instruments of prosecution and punishment, therefore carried with them a host of carefully worded clauses which determine the gravity of the offence and the consequent changes in the nature of the punishment according to the circumstances of each case. Thus in the early days of the Pātimokkha recital with which we associate the very dynamic function of 'dealing with offenders' (*tam mayam yathādhammam yathāsattham kārema*. M.III.10), the details connected with each rule were as vital as the rule itself. Every competent monk had to be a master of the text of what was to be recited at the Uddesa (i.e. *sutta*) together with those details (*sutta-vibhaṅga*).¹ They were undoubtedly parts of one single text and one cannot always speak of the details as being of later origin. Some of the historical prefaces and the amendments to the rules are evidently contemporary accounts and would have been essential in the application of the Pātimokkha as a legal system. Thus the reference to the Pātimokkha in terms of *suttato* and *anuvyañjanaso* undoubtedly covers the contents of the Suttavibhaṅga which embodies the Pātimokkha together

¹ Vin.II.96f.

with the details connected with it.¹ These details were vitally needed in the days when the Uddesa was no mere recital of the list of rules but a trial at which the offenders thus discovered were to be judged and dealt with according to the law.

Further proof of this literary position of the Pātimokkha is seen in the solitary Canonical account of the First Buddhist Council, the Saṅgīti which was held soon after the demise of the Buddha. In the record of the literary activity of this Saṅgīti it is said that the venerable Mahā Kassapa questioned the venerable Upāli on the contents of the Ubhato Vinaya,² commencing with the first Pārājika with all its details (*Atha kho*

¹ Vin.I.65

² Rhys Davids has discovered in a Burmese manuscript the reading *ubhato vibhange* in place of this. See *Vinaya Texts* III [SBE.XX.], p.376. n.1. See also B.C. Law, *History of Pali Literature* I. p.16. We are fully in agreement with the view expressed by Rhys Davids regarding this reading. Strange enough, we also discover the Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series [Sri Lankan Edition] adopting the *ubhato vibhange* and reporting that the Burmese has *ubhato vinaye*. We recently discovered that the newly reprinted edition of the Cambodian Tripitaka at the Buddhist Institute in Phnom Penh preserves the reading *ubhato vinaye* and reports Burmese as having *ubhato vibhange*. We are of the opinion that *ubhato vinaye* is the more meaningful reading in this context.

āyasmā mahākassapo āyasmantam upālim paṭhamassa pārājikassa vatthum'pi pucchi nidānam'pi pucchi puggalam'pi pucchi paññattim'pi pucchi anupaññattim'pi pucchi āpattim'pi pucchi anāpattim'pi pucchi... Eten'eva upāyena ubhato vinaya pucchi. Vin.II.287). There is little doubt that Ubhato Vinaya refers to the disciplinary code of the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis and we are fairly safe in assuming this to be primarily the two Vibhaṅgas, [i.e. the codified rules of the Pātimokkha together with their legally relevant details of application as was revealed in the above report], though not necessarily in their present form. Thus it becomes clear that the text of the Pātimokkha was something already contained in the Vibhaṅgas, the Mahāvibhaṅga and the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. No special mention of it is made under that name any where in the proceedings of the first Council. We are also compelled to add here that Ubhato Vinaya of the above report should include, under the connotation of that phrase, a reasonable amount of the core contents of the other section of the Vinaya known as the Khandhaka as well. That was vital for the execution of the ecclesiastical acts for the Saṅgha as a corporate body.

Sukumar Dutt attempts in the following remarks to offer a different explanation for this omission: "In the reported proceedings, the term, Pātimokkha is nowhere mentioned, but all the heads of misdemeanour on the part of a Bhikkhu are

listed except the Sekhiyas and the procedural rules of Adhikaranasamatha. The reason for the studied omission of the word, Pātimokkha, is not far to seek if we assume that at the time when the proceedings were put into the present narrative shape, the Bhikkhus understood by Pātimokkha something quite different from a code of Vinaya rules."¹

Here we are prepared to concede that the 'time when the proceedings were put into the present narrative shape' may even be some time after the Second Buddhist Council.² On Dutt's own admission almost all the *sikkhāpada* of the extant Pātimokkha code were known by then. For he says: 'but all the heads of misdemeanour on the part of a Bhikkhu are listed except the Sekhiyas and the procedural rules of Adhikaranasamatha.' On the other hand, he also says: 'at the time....the Bhikkhus understood by Pātimokkha something quite different from a code of Vinaya rules.' What then did this body of *sikkhāpada* mean to them? Was their Pātimokkha still a 'communal confession of Faith in a set from of hymn-singing' ?³ However, in the succeeding paragraph Dutt says the following: 'The code, whatever its original contents, became after the First

¹ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.73.

² Vin.I. p.xxix.

³ S.Dutt - op.cit. p.73.

Council the bond of association of the Buddhist Bhikkhus, and was called Pātimokkha (Bond). Thus the old name for a confession of faith came to be foisted on something new, a code of Prohibitions for a Bhikkhu.¹ This attempted explanation of the omission of the term Pātimokkha in the proceedings of the First Council is far from being conclusive.

It is the Vibhaṅga and not the Pātimokkha which had the completeness of a code of discipline. That alone was the effective instrument of discipline, though one could have opted to learn only the body of rules in isolation. We find the *sutta* and the *suttavibhaṅga* referred to severally (*Tassa n'eva suttam āgatam hoti no suttavibhaṅgo*. Vin.II.96). But out of these two, it is the *suttavibhaṅga* which is looked upon as the Vinaya proper even in the commentarial tradition (*No suttavibhaṅgo ti vinayo na paguṇo*. VinA.VI.1197). The *sutta* has only the value of an extract, an abridged version or *mātikā*.²

In course of time, the recital of the Pātimokkha lost its legal validity and function, as would be shown in the following chapter. The details regarding the application of rules would have then proved themselves to be irksome to those whose

¹ Ibid. p.74.

² VinA.VI.1197.

only interest in the Pātimokkha was for the sake of its fortnightly recital, mainly as an instrument of monastic get-together and consolidation. The Vinayavinicchaya perhaps attempts to establish this attitude to the Pātimokkha in the following statement, which contrasts the Pavāraṇā with the Uposatha and asserts that the latter is for the purpose of stability and consolidation of the monastic community: *Uposatho samaggaṭṭho visuddhatthā pavāraṇā*. Vinvi.p.190. v.2599. There seems to be very little doubt that the term *uposatha* here stands for the fortnightly meeting at which the recital of the Pātimokkha is the main concern. At such a stage one would readily concede the extraction of the text of the rules, and the rules alone, from the Suttavibhaṅga to form an independent unit. Thus we would regard the emergence of an independent text by the name of Pātimokkha, which contained only the *sikkhāpada* and the instructions regarding their recital, to be historically later than the very substantial text of the Suttavibhaṅga.

Oldenberg, however, is very definite about the theory that the list called the Pātimokkha 'is the earliest specimen of Buddhist Vinaya literature that we possess'.¹ In support of this he says that if we read the ordinances of the Pātimokkha,

¹ Vin.I.p.xvi.

without the commentary of the Vibhaṅga, we find that they constitute one uninterrupted whole.¹ It is our opinion that this alleged continuity is more imaginary than real. If we begin with the four Pārājika rules of the Pātimokkha, even a cursory glance at them would show that there is no more continuity among them than their being grouped together under a single category. The position is identically the same with regard to their continuity even if we examine them in the Suttavibhaṅga, not better nor worse.

On the other hand, in the Suttavibhaṅga version the *sikkhāpada* come to possess more meaning and significance with regard to their disciplinary role. The generalised rule which occurs in isolation in the Pātimokkha looks revitalised when viewed in the specific setting of its origin. Nor does the fact that three or four rules in succession deal with different aspects of the same subject support Oldenberg's theory of continuity. For thereafter, there occurs irreconcilable deviation into a completely new theme. (Compare the Saṅghādisesa 6 and 7 in relation to the first five rules of the same group). Further he says: `and, moreover, it frequently happens that a rule refers to the one immediately preceding it, in a manner that would be altogether unintelligible if the two had been originally separated

¹ Ibid.p.xvii.

by the intervening explanations of the Vibhaṅga.¹ Here too, we find it difficult to subscribe to this view. He cites two examples in support of his statement. He points out the phrase *tassa bhikkhuno* which occurs in Pācittiya 49 as an indication of its link with the preceding rule. We would readily concede this, but we are unable to accept the position that the 'intervening explanation of the Vibhanga' would make it 'altogether unintelligible'. On the other hand, we would like to point out that the phrase *aññatra tathārūpaccayā* of Pācittiya 48 would be completely unintelligible without the explanations of the Vibhaṅga. We would make the same comments regarding the phrase *tathāvādinā bhikkhunā* of Pācittiya 69, which Oldenberg gives as the second example. The introductory story of this Pācittiya rule clearly specifies this *tathāvādinā bhikkhunā* as being Ariṭṭha, who was a well known character both in the Suttas and in the Vinaya.

Regarding this intelligibility of the rules without their explanations which Oldenberg assumes, we would commend the scrutiny of a few rules from the Pātimokkha which, on account of their very elliptical nature, would make very little sense in the enforcement of discipline without an acquaintance with their background. The following deserve special mention:

¹ Ibid.

Pācittiya:

12 *Aññavādake pācittiyam*

52 *Āṅgulipatodake pācittiyam*

53 *Udake hāsadhamme pācittiyam*

54 *Anādariye pācittiyam*¹

As for the details regarding the rules which occur in the Suttavibhaṅga, it need hardly be said that the explanations of the contents of the rules and the provision of modifications to the rules could not have preceded the rules themselves. But this does not necessarily separate them from the rules by a very wide margin of time and once they came into being this element would not have been divorced from the rest of the legal system as these details were necessary for its proper enforcement.

When we examine the stories which are given in the Suttavibhaṅga as leading to the promulgation of the rules we feel that the majority of these can be regarded as historical and that they serve a useful purpose in the proper understanding of the law. However, we are prepared to accept the position that some of the stories are possibly the contribution of the editors who felt that every rule, however simple or spontaneously laid

¹ Vin.IV.35f, 110f, 111f, 113 respectively.

Chapter VIII - The Codified Law of the Saigha

down, should have a preceding incident leading up to it. This provision of a 'historical basis' (*nidāna*) could have happened both in the case of rules which were not necessarily provoked by a specific incident and those whose stories of origin were replaced in course of time with more attractive versions.

Chapter VIII - The Codified Law of the Saigha

Here are a few such cases which we think lie open to this criticism:

The rule	It's meaning	The incident leading to it
-----------------	---------------------	-----------------------------------

Pāc.1 1	<p><i>Bhūtagā</i></p> <p><i>ma</i></p> <p><i>pātavya-</i></p> <p><i>tāya</i></p> <p><i>pācittiya</i></p> <p><i>ṃ¹</i></p>	<p>Destructi on of plant life brings about a Pācittiya offence.</p>	<p>In the act of cutting a tree a Bhikkhu enraged a deity who was resident in it and escaped death at his hands by the skin of his teeth.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> But the spirit in which the rule had been laid down accords more with the popular belief that trees possess life (<i>jjīvasaññino hi moghapurisā manussā rukhasmiṃ.</i>¹ See also Vin.I.189.).</p> <p>People did protest against the destruction of plant life by the Buddhist monks (<i>Ekindriyaṃ samaṇā sakya- puttiyā jīvaṃ vihetthentī ti.</i>¹ See also Vin.I.189).</p>
------------	--	---	---

¹ Ibid.34.

Pāc.5 7	<p><i>Yo pana bhikkhu orenaddh amāsaṃ nahāyeyy a aññatra samayā pācittiya ṃ</i>¹</p>	<p>Bathing more often than once a fortnight, except during specified seasons, leads to a Pācittiya offence</p>	<p>Monks who were given to frequent bathing monopolised the baths where the king himself was used to go. The king was inconvenienced and the Buddha is said to have rebuked the monks for not realising the limits of their bathing even after they had seen the king. Hence this legislation.¹</p> <p><i>Note:</i> It is more likely that in a setting where austerity was the hallmark of virtue frequent bathing would have been looked upon as a proneness to luxury.</p>
------------	---	--	--

¹ Ibid.117.

Pācittiyas 56 and 61 have a similar appearance.¹

Oldenberg also raises the question of a contradiction in the relationship of the traditions of the Pātimokkha to those of the Vibhaṅga.² Here too, we are compelled to say that this contradiction vanishes when we view the problem from a different angle. Oldenberg has already taken up the position that the Pātimokkha and the Vibhaṅga are from the very beginning two distinct units which stand apart. We have shown why we refuse to accept this position. The contents of what is spoken of here as the Pātimokkha are the rules governing the conduct of the members of the monastic community which had acquired, very early, an unalterably fixed character. Flexibility in the application of this legal system was the theme of the living tradition which grew on and around it and was considered so essential from the earliest times (*Ubhayāni kho pana'ssa pātimokkhāni vitthārena svāgatāni honti suvibhattāni suppavattīni suvinicchitāni suttato anuvyañjanaso*. Vin.I.65).

The changing pattern of monastic organization would have necessitated a corresponding change in the monastic administration. There is clear evidence of such changes,

¹ Vin.IV.115, 124 respectively.

² Vin.I.p.xix.

particularly in the acts of Pabbajjā and Upasampadā.¹ The responsibility that was once the right of individual Bhikkhus had to be latterly vested in the collective organization of the Saṅgha. With every such change it was not possible to alter the structure of the rules of the Pātimokkha. On the other hand, the living traditions which accompanied it closely from the very beginning and constituted the contents of the Vibhaṅgas stood up to serve as a complement to the Pātimokkha. These are the changes which the Suttavibhaṅga shows in relation to the Pātimokkha and we have no doubt that they would have been smoothly effected through a sensible acceptance of the traditions of the Suttavibhaṅga.

The *sikkhāpada* which constitute the Pātimokkha have a new emphasis and are very different in character from advice and counsel given in the Dhamma under the category of *sīla*. They are at times restatements of items of *sīla*, increasing in number and diversity according to the needs of the monastic organization of the Saṅgha.² Besides these, a number of regulations governing residence, food and clothing of the members of the Saṅgha as well as series of rules covering monastic propriety and procedure, and communal harmony of

¹ Ibid.22, 56, 82.

² M.I.444; S.II.224

the society of the Saṅgha are also found in the Pātimokkha. However, as a code for the guidance of monks in their pursuit of religious development, these *sikkhāpada* are far more exacting and obligatory than the *sīla*.

The *sīla* concept, for example, of abstaining from destruction of life includes within it non-injury and the love and protection of life of every sort, both human and animal (*Pāṇātipātāṃ pahāya pāṇātipātā paṭivirato hoti nihitadaṇḍo nihitasattho lajjī dayāpanno sabbapāṇabhūtahitānukampī viharati*. D.I.63). But in the *sikkhāpada* of the Pātimokkha where both prosecution and punishment are contemplated, the gravity of the offence of killing is fixed at different levels, drawing a distinction between human and animal life. The destruction of human life is classed among the Pārājika offences, the four greatest crimes under the monastic discipline which involve expulsion and complete loss of monastic status. Pārājika No.3, which covers this subject of homicide, also regards other conditions such as aiding and abetting which would contribute to the commission of the crime of suicide, as being equally reprehensible.¹

There is a further rule pertaining to destruction of life, other than human, included under the lesser offence of Pācittiya.

¹ Vin.III.73.

(Pāc.61: *Yo pana bhikkhu sañcicca pāṇaṃ jīvitaṃ voropeyya pācittiyaṃ* - Vin.IV.124.) Both the Old Commentary in the Suttavibhaṅga which defines *pāṇa* in this context as *tiracchānagatapāṇa* and the history of the *sikkhāpada* narrated there just before the text of the rule establish the fact that this rule concerns itself with the destruction only of animal life.¹ Thus we notice that considerations which under the category of *sīla* had moral values are now, as *sikkhāpada*, forced into a legal frame-work, involving at times a sacrifice of the spirit in which they were originally introduced. Another clear instance of this is Pārājika No.2 which deals with stealing. Under the category of *sīla* theft meant the appropriation of whatever was not given and the scheming to obtaining the same (*Adinnādānaṃ pahāya adinnādānā paṭivirato hoti dinnādāyī dinnapāṭikaṅkhī athenena sucibhūtena attanā viharatī*. D.I.63). But as a Pārājika rule, the regulation against stealing seeks further, backing from the law of the land, coupling together as it were both moral and legal considerations. The Buddha is in fact seen consulting a former Minister of Justice, who was now ordained as a monk, on this matter (*Yo pana bhikkhu gāmā vā araññā vā adinnaṃ theyyasaṅkhātāṃ ādiyeyya yathārūpe adinnādāne rājāno coram gahetvā haneyyumaṃ vā bandheyyaṃ*

¹ Vin.IV.124.

vā pabbājeyyumaṃ vā coro'si bālo'si mūlho'si theno'sī'ti tathārūpaṃ bhikkhu adinnaṃ ādiyamāno ayam'pi pārājiko hoti asaṃvāso. Vin.III.45).

There is no doubt that it was soon felt that the four items of discipline brought under the category of Pārājikā and stated in legal phraseology were necessarily circumscribed in relation to the moral well being of the true *pabbajita*. Thus while the greatest respect was shown to the codified monastic law an attempt was made to infuse into these four major items of discipline the spirit of *sīla* which comes in the earlier Sutta tradition. We find expression given to this in the declaration of Cattāri Akaraṇīyāni which are mentioned in the Mahāvagga.¹ These are given there as four major items of discipline which no monk who has gained higher ordination shall transgress. He shall guard himself in terms of these all his life. Thus it is required by law that these should be made known to a Bhikkhu soon after the conferment of *upasampadā* or higher ordination on him.

The wider field of control of the Akaraṇīyāni in marked contrast to the Pārājikas is particularly evident in the items 2 and 3 which deal with theft and destruction of life respectively. It

¹ Vin.I.96f.

Chapter VIII - The Codified Law of the Saigha

is these two, as we have shown above, which underwent serious contraction in the process of legalization. Under the category of Akaraṇīyāni the spirit which they lost appears to be restored. Note the wider applicability of the Akaraṇīyāni 2 and 3 which are given below.

Akaraṇīya

2. *Upasampannena bhikkhunā adinnaṃ theyyasankhātāṃ na ādāttabbaṃ antamaso tiṇasalākaṃ upādāya.*¹ i.e.

No Bhikkhu who is an *upasampanna* shall take in theft what is not given to him, even as much as a blade of grass.

3. *Upasampannena bhikkhunā sañcicca pāṇo jīvītā na voropetabbo antamaso kunthakipillikaṃ upādāya.*² i.e.

No Bhikkhu who is an *upasampanna* shall destroy the life even of an ant.

Sukumar Dutt makes a suggestion which gives the impression that the Cattāri Akaraṇīyāni were the precursors of the four Pārājikas.³ But a closer examination of the Vinaya texts would reveal the fact that this assumption lacks historical support. In the text of the Akaraṇīyāni we find the precisely worded clauses of the Pārājikas embedded almost in their

¹ Ibid.96.

² Ibid.97.

³ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.66.

entirety. They also show an awareness of the incidents which are related in the Suttavibhaṅga connected with the promulgation of the rules.¹ Akaraṇīyāni are obviously the result of a fusion of the legal statements pertaining to the Pārājikas from the Suttavibhaṅga with the general spirit of the sīla from the Sutta Piṭaka. This establishes beyond doubt the vital position which the items of discipline included under the four Pārājika came to occupy in Buddhist monasticism.

Let us examine further the relationship of the Pārājika rules to the lists of sīlas. The first thing that strikes us is the difference in the order of these items in the two groups, i.e. sīlas and the sikkhāpada of the Pātimokkha. The sīlas commence with abstinence from destruction of life. Considerations regarding theft come second and the vow of celibacy is listed as the third item. Under the Pārājikas, on the other hand, celibacy takes the first place. Destruction of life, which is now restricted to destruction of human life alone, stands as the third item. These two items have thus changed places in the two groups.

¹ Note: *antamaso tiracchānagatāyā'pi* of Akaraṇīya 1 and Pārājika 1. Vin.I.96 and Vin.III.23. as well as *pādaṃ vā pādārahaṃ vā atirekapādaṃ vā* of Akaraṇīya 2 and Pārājika 2. Vin.1.96 and Vin.III.45, 47.

Regarding these discrepancies¹ we would make the following observations:

Sīla, at least in part, remain the common property of both monks and laymen. The laymen are capable of keeping some of them. With the addition of abstinence from intoxicants² a list of five items of sīla is constituted for the guidance of the daily life of lay persons. On special occasions, they observe three additional sīlas, thus making a total of eight. It is on those occasions alone that the laity take the vow of celibacy temporarily [for a specific duration of twenty-four hours]: abrahmacariyā veramaṇī. At all other times the sīla of the laity specifies this as the vow of chastity, i.e. restraint in the enjoyment of sex pleasures: kāmesu micchācārā veramaṇī. Commentaries repeatedly explain kāmesu here as methuna-samācāre. Monks alone take the vow of complete celibacy to be observed all their life. Hence we would regard this virtue of celibacy as one of the primary distinguishing features which marks out the monk from the layman. It is also clear from the history of the Pārājikas that nothing else seems to have run so

¹ See Miss Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I. p.xxiv.

² This does not occur in the lists of *sīla* which are given in the Suttas. See D.I.4ff., 63ff.; M.I.179f. etc. As an item of discipline for the monks it occurs in the Pātimokkha as Pācittiya 51. See Vin.IV.108-10.

contrary to the spirit of pabbajjā as the violation of this virtue of celibacy. For Sudinna, who is presented as the first miscreant who violated this virtue, is accused of having directly contradicted the fundamental teachings of the Buddha. (Tattha nāma tvam āvuso bhagavatā virāgāya dhamme desite sarāgāya cetessasi viṣaṃyogāya dhamme desite saṃyogāya cetessasi anupādānāya dhamme desite saupādānāya cetessasi.... Nanu āvuso bhagavatā anekapariyāyena kāmānaṃ pahānaṃ akkhātaṃ kāmasaññānaṃ pariññā akkhātā kāmapiṇḍānaṃ paṭivīnayo akkhāto kāmavitakkānaṃ samugghāto akkhāto kāmapiṇḍānaṃ vūpasamo akkhāto. Vin.III.19f.). Hence we would regard the prominence given to this rule pertaining to the virtue of celibacy in the codified law of the Saṅgha as being quite legitimate. It savours of the very essence of nekkhamma or renunciation which is the basis of pabbajjā.¹

But we are aware of the fact that the Pārājikas have been assessed differently by some scholars. This is what Dr. Nagai has to say regarding the first Pārājika: `With regard to the problem of inhibitions for priests, one that will remain perplexing for a long time to come is the inhibition concerning sexual relations. To me it appears that the problem of inhibitions for the

¹ See *supra* p. 84.

Buddhist priests of the present day (except those belonging to the Shinshū Sect) depends upon the manner of interpretation of this particular inhibition. If it is interpreted as one requiring all Buddhist priests to observe celibacy, I fear that very few priests will be found living in Japan who are really worthy of the name bhikkhu.¹ There is no doubt that it is the bold venture of Shinran in the 13th century which led to this state of affairs in Japan. It is not possible to undertake a full analysis of this in the present study. However, unless it is admitted that the concepts of bhikkhu and priest in this context are incomparably different, one from the other, we are not in a position to concede this magnanimity in the interpretation of the first Pārājika rule. The early history of the religion and the nature of its fundamental teachings do not seem to allow it.

We should here refer the reader to the observations of Miss Horner on the regulations governing the lives of the Buddhist disciples. `If monks behaved in a way that was censurable in monks, this does not necessarily mean that their conduct was wrong in itself. Various activities were not only permissible for lay-people, but were fully accepted to be such as could be unquestionably pursued by them. Marriage, negotiating for

¹ *Buddhistic Studies*, ed. B.C.Law, p.381: Dr. M. Nagai on Buddhist Vinaya Discipline.

parties to a marriage, trading, the owning of possessions, are cases in point.... I think it very likely that some of the courses of training for monks that are included in this volume were formulated as a result of this bringing over of lay-life into the religious life; for a difference between the two had to be made, and then maintained.¹ We feel that these remarks are obviously the result of a thorough understanding of original authoritative texts which deal with Buddhist monasticism.

In the evaluation of the Pārājikas, however, the fourth Pārājika seems to have confronted Miss Horner with some serious difficulty. For she says: "The curious fourth Pārājika, concerned with the offence of 'claiming a state of quality of further-men' (uttarimanussadhamma), seems to have been fashioned in some different mould, and to belong to some contrasting realm of values."² This attitude towards the fourth Pārājika has made her evaluate the four Pārājikas from a new angle. She remarks: 'For I think it possible that the Pārājikas are arranged in an ascending scale of gravity, in which the offence held to be the worst morally, though not legally, is placed last.'³ We find it difficult to agree with this. In an attempt

¹ Miss Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I.p.xvii f.

² *Ibid.*p.xxiv.

³ *Ibid.*p.xxv.

to regard the fourth Pārājika as supremely important it is hardly possible to consider the first Pārājika as being the least offensive morally. We would regard it to be undoubtedly the worst, for it runs contrary to the basic teachings of Buddhism, whose main theme is virāga, viśaṃyoga etc.¹ We have already shown above what we consider to be the significance of this sikkhāpada which gives it the pride of place among the Pārājikas.

Let us now examine the fourth Pārājika, which is said [by Miss. Hornert] to rival the first in moral value. The text of the sikkhāpada is as follows: "Whatever monk should boast, with reference to himself of a state of further-men, sufficient ariyan knowledge and insight, though not knowing it fully, and saying: This I know, this I see, then if later on, he, being pressed or not being pressed, fallen, should desire to be purified, and should say: 'Your reverence, I said that I know what I do not know, see what I do not see, I spoke idly, falsely, vainly,' apart from the undue estimate of himself, he also is one who is defeated, he is not in communion."² This sikkhāpada provides that no monk shall make false claims (*anabhijānaṃ'ti asantaṃ abhūtaṃ asaṃvijjamaṇaṃ ajānanto apassanto attani kusalaṃ dhammaṃ*

¹ Vin.III.19.

² Miss Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I.p.159.

atthi me kusalo dhammo'ti. Vin.III.91) to spiritual attainments except under the pain of being expelled from the Order. The sikkhāpada refers to such attainments under the terms *iti jānāmi iti passāmi*.

It is clear that the state or quality of further-men (*uttarimanussa-dhamma*) referred to here pertains to the realm of emancipation and hence reckons exclusively with knowledge and insight. *Uttarimanussadhamma* also marks different stages in the process of spiritual development like the eight *jhānas* and the state of *Saññāvedayitanirodha*.¹ The *Suttavibhaṅga* appears to take note of both these in its comment on *uttarimanussadhamma*. (Note: *Uttarimanussadhammo nāma jhānaṃ vimokkhaṃ samādhī samāpatti nāṇadassanaṃ maggabhāvanā phalasadakkhīyā kilesapahānaṃ vinīvaraṇatā cittassa suññāgāre abhirati* - Vin.III.91). At the same time there is also reference to *uttarimanussadhamma* in association with less transcendental achievements like the ability to exercise miraculous powers. This is referred to as *uttarimanussadhammaṃ iddhi-pāṭhāriyaṃ* (Note: *na bhikkhave gihīnaṃ uttarimanussadhammaṃ iddhipāṭihāriyaṃ dassetabbaṃ.* Vin.II.112).

¹ M.I.209.

The spirit of this sikkhāpada seems to be made further clear in the Buddha's reference to the five great thieves who are identified with different types of monks which occurs in the introduction to the sikkhāpada. The fifth thief who is referred to here as the greatest of all is described in terms which coincide, more or less, with the text of the sikkhāpada. (Note: *Ayaṃ aggo mahācoro yo asantaṃ abhūtaṃ uttarimanussadhammaṃ ullapati. Vin. III. 9*). Thereafter, the Buddha proceeds to give a reason for the stigmatisation of such attempts. The reason is that the monks who do so subsist on what is collected by theft (*Taṃ kissa hetu. Theyyāya vo bhikkhave raṭṭhapiṇḍo bhutto'ti. Vin.III.90*).

This emphasis on the correctness of ājīva or the mode of earning a living is seen to be specifically so in the incident which led to the promulgation of the fourth Pārājika (*Varaṃ tumhehi moghapurisā tiṇhena govikattanena kucchi parikanto natv 'eva udarassa kāraṇā gihīnam aññaamaññaṃ uttarimanussadhammassa vaṇṇo bhāsito. Vin.III.89*). Further, the text assures us that it was a false claim which they made before the laymen (*Kacci pana vo bhikkhave bhūtan'ti. Abhūtaṃ bhagavā'ti. Vin.III.89*).

At the same time we should also take note of the fact that Pācittiya 8 too, records the incidents of the fourth Pārājika

almost in identical terms. The one point of difference, and that is vital here, is that the spiritual attainments of the Bhikkhus of which they give publicity to lay people are states to which they had genuinely attained. Hence there does not arise a question of dishonesty here and the offence is only the lesser one of Pācittiya.¹

Apart from considerations of honesty and truthfulness of a monk in the mode of obtaining his requisites from the laymen there seems to be yet another associated idea in this sikkhāpada. To our mind it is the unscrupulous exploitation of the regard and the respect which the lay people of the time had for 'these 'super-human achievements' which were generally associated with those who had renounced the household life.² The Setṭhi of Rājagaha sums up this position beautifully when he says *yo samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā arahā c'eva iddhimā ca*, i.e. any monk or brahmin who is both an Arahant and one who is possessed of miraculous powers.³ People viewed such

¹ Vin.IV.23 f. See also Miss Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, II.p.xxxix.

² A notable exception to this is Citta, the householder, who as a layman had attained *uttarimanussadhamma alamariyaññānādassanavisesa* as far as the fourth *jhāna* and was declared to be an Anāgāmin. See S.IV.301.

³ Vin.II.110. See Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p.351.n.2.

superhuman achievements with awe and credulity, with little scrutiny as to whether those claims were genuine or false. Hence a false claim would be deemed an act of meanness which is unworthy of a Buddhist disciple.

On the other hand, it is said that even where claims to such superhuman powers were real a true Buddhist disciple would not display them in public for the sake of worldly and personal benefits. The Vinaya Piṭaka tells us of the elder Piṇḍolabhāradvāja who was sternly rebuked by the Buddha for displaying his superhuman powers by performing miraculous feats in public for the sake of winning a sandal-wood bowl. Thereafter, the Buddha forbade such acts and decreed that one who did so was guilty of a Dukkaṭa offence (Na bhikkhave gihīnaṃ uttarimanussadhammaṃ iddhipāṭihāriyaṃ dassetabbaṃ Yo dasseyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. Vin.II.112). In the Saṃyutta Nikāya it is said that the venerable Mahaka once performed a similar miracle (uttarimanussadhammaṃ iddhipāṭihāriyaṃ) before Citta, the house-holder, but with no desire for personal gain. However, as a result of it when Citta invited him to stay in Macchikāsaṇḍa, promising to provide him with his requisites, he left the place never to return again.¹ Perhaps he did so out of his conviction that if he remained to

¹ S.IV.290f.

enjoy the hospitality which was offered he would be guilty of having `earned it' in the wrong way.

We would now sum up our observations on the fourth Pārājika as follows:

Claims to superhuman powers and attainments and to the title Arahant appear to have been part of the aspirations of most groups of religious men of India who had left the household life.

Judging by the great esteem in which such powers were held by the public there is no doubt that any such claim would have been received with great acclamation.

Thus, for the petty purpose of ensuring for oneself a `comfortable living' any false claim to superhuman powers and attainments would amount to a despicable form of lying. Hence the inclusion of the offence, like that of theft, in the category of Pārājika.

Where such powers and attainments were genuinely achieved, any public declaration, other than in the presence of monks and nuns, would amount to a vulgar display and is ranked in the

Vinaya as an offence which is lesser in gravity than the former. It is a Pācittiya offence.

As such, we are unable to see how the fourth Pārājika could be morally more significant than the first.

It has also been generally assumed that the fourth Pārājika finds no parallel among the *sīlas*.¹ But after the analysis we have made above of this Pārājika it becomes clear that the injunction against false claims to superhuman attainments is laid down because such claims are made with a view to gaining an easy livelihood in a manner which is unworthy of a monk. It is evidently for this same reason that Buddhaghosa introduces this Pārājika rule as one laid down for the guidance of *ājīvapārisuddhi* or purity of livelihood in his definition of *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla* (... *ājīvapārisuddhisīle ājīvahetu paññattānaṃ channaṃ sikkhāpadānaṃ'ti yāni tāni ājīvahetu ājīvakāraṇā pāpiccho icchāpakato asantam abhūtam uttarimanussadhammaṃ ullapati āpatti pārājikassa*. Vism.I.22).

¹ See Miss Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I. p. xxiv: 'The fourth Pārājika, alone of the Pārājikas, does not find any corresponding matter among the *sīlas*.'

It is also of interest to note that Buddhaghosa couples the six *sikkhāpada* which he introduces under *Ājīvapārisuddhisīla* with similar considerations on *ājīvapārisuddhi* which he derives from the category of *sīla* (...*kuhanā lapanā nemittakatā nippesikatā lābhena lābhaṃ nijigimsanatā'ti evaṃ ādīnañ ca pāpadhammānaṃ vasena pavattā micchājīvā viratī*. Vism.I.16) These hint at both fraud and artful conversation as means of gaining an easy livelihood in an unworthy manner. These considerations are traceable to item 36 in the list of *sīla* (*Yathā vā paṇ'eke bhonto samaṇabrāhmaṇā saddhādeyyāni bhojanāni bhuñjitvā te kuhakā ca honti lapakā ca nemittikā ca nippesikā ca lābhena ca lābhaṃ nijigimsitāro. Iti evarūpā kuhanā lapanā paṭivirato hoti. Idam pi'ssa hoti sīlasmim*. D.I.67. Sec.55)¹ The scope of both Pārājika 4 and Pācittiya 8 seems to be within the range of this item of *sīla*. Thus we feel inclined to assume that the fourth Pārājika too, as much as the other three, is traceable to the broader basis of *sīla* which in the early history of Buddhist monasticism was the primary guide in the life of the *pabbajita*.

Further modifications which *sīla* underwent while they were expressed in the form of *sikkhāpada* are witnessed in Pācittiya 1 and 3 which deal with lying (*musāvāda*) and tale-bearing (*pisuṇāvāca*) respectively. Here, the original concepts which

¹ Also D.I.8. Sec.20.

Chapter VIII - The Codified Law of the Saigha

occur under *sīla* are narrowed down and are made more specific.

Sīla

*Musāvādaṃ pahāya musāvādā
paṭivirato hoti saccavādī saccasandho
theto paccayiko avisaṃvādako
lokassa.¹*

*Pisuṇāvācam pahāya pisuṇāya
vācāya paṭivirato hoti ito sutvā na
amutra akkhātā imesaṃ bhedāya
amutra vā sutvā na imesaṃ akkhātā
amūsaṃ bhedāya. Iti bhinnānaṃ
sandhātā sahitānaṃ vā anuppadātā
samaggārāmo samaggarato
samagganandī samaggakaraṇiṃ
vācaṃ bhāsītā.³*

Sikkhāpada

*Sampajānamusāvā
de pācittiyaṃ²*

*Bhikkhupesunñe
pācittiyaṃ.⁴*

Besides these sikkhāpada which are closely related to *sīla* or the personal moral well-being of the disciple, there are also a

¹ D.I.63.

² Ibid.63f.

³ Vin.IV.2.

⁴ Ibid.12.

host of others in the Pātimokkha which attempt to maintain the concord and communal harmony of the Buddhist Saṅgha. A number of sikkhāpada of the Saṅghādisesa group aim at achieving this end.¹

These may be broadly classified as calculated to suppress:

- a) Attempts to despise and discredit fellow members of the Order by making false and unfounded accusations of a definitely serious nature against them with a view to damaging their spiritual life. Saṅghādisesa 8 and 9 appear to safeguard against such situations.

"Whatever monk, malignant, malicious and ill-tempered should defame a monk with an unfounded charge involving defeat, thinking: 'Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life,' then, if afterwards he, being pressed or not being pressed, the legal question turning out to be unfounded, if the monk

¹ See Saṅghādisesa 8-13: Vin.III.158-86

confesses his malice, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order."¹

- b) Attempts to disrupt the united organization of the Saṅgha by canvassing public opinion against the Saṅgha and by instituting disciplinary action manoeuvred to cause disunity.²

"Whatever monk should go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, or should persist in taking up some legal question leading to a dissension:.... there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order."³

Such tendencies were clearly manifest in the activities of Devadatta. The following remarks of Devadatta betray him completely:

"It is possible, your reverence, with these five items, to make a schism in the Order of the

¹ *Book of the Discipline*, l.p.281: Saṅghādisesa 8.

² See Saṅghādisesa 10 and 11: Vin.III.171-77

³ *Book of the Discipline* l.p.299: Saṅghādisesa 10

recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord. For, your reverence, people esteem austerity."¹

- c) Attempts to resist, under various pretexts, correction of bad and unworthy behaviour which is justly undertaken by fellow members.²

" If a monk is one who is difficult to speak to, and if himself being spoken to by the monks according to dhamma concerning the courses of training included in the exposition, he reckons himself as one not to be spoken to, saying: `Do not say anything to me, venerable ones, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the venerable ones, either good or bad; refrain venerable ones, from speaking to me'... there an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order."³

There is yet another collection of 16 *sikkhāpada* (including rules from the Nissaggiya, Pācittiya and Pāṭidesanīya groups) whose purpose is to safeguard the mutual relations of the

¹ Ibid.p.297.

² See Saṅghādisesa 12 and 13: Vin.III.177-86

³ *Book of the Discipline* I.p.310.

Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis.¹ These must admittedly bear the stamp of relative lateness in that they pertain to Bhikkhunis, the members of the latterly established Order of nuns. Irregular performance of monastic duties and excesses in personal relationships which are detrimental to the progress of the religious life and also would provoke public censure come within the purview of these regulations.

Their distribution is as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Nissaggiya 4
and 17 | : Monks engaging the services of the
nuns |
| Pācittiya 26 | : Monks rendering services to the
nuns |
| Nis. 5 and Pāc.
59 | : Monks accepting and using robes
belonging to the nuns. |
| Pācittiya 25 | : Monks giving robes to the nuns |
| Pācittiya 29 | : Nuns expressing their personal
attachment to the monks. |
| Pāṭidesanīya 1
and 2 Pācittiya | : Irregular performance of monastic
duties by monks towards the nuns. |

¹ See Ch.XIV for a comparative study of Bhikkhu and Bhikkhuni Pātimokkhas

21 - 24

Pācittiya 27, 28, : Irregular social relationships of
30 monks towards the nuns.

In the group of Pācittiya are found a number of rules which deal with matters of procedure and propriety to be observed within the monastic organization so that its collective honour and authority may in no way be undermined.¹ A monk shall not maliciously challenge the validity of an expiatory act which has been properly carried out by members of the Saṅgha and urge for its performance again. (*Yo pana bhikkhu jānaṃ yathādhamaṃ nihatādhikaraṇaṃ punakammāya ukkoṭeyya pācittiyaṃ* - Vin.IV.126: Pāc.63). He should also not conduct himself in such a way as to reduce or nullify the effect of an act of punishment inflicted on an offender.² Nor should he repudiate the authority or doubt the competence of his fellow members when they advise him on matters of discipline. (*Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhūhi sahadhammikaṃ vuccamāno evaṃ vadeyya na tāvā'haṃ āvuso etasmiṃ sikkhāpade sikkhissāmi yāva na aññaṃ bhikkhuṃ vyattaṃ vinayadharaṃ paripucchāmi'ti pācittiyaṃ*. Vin.IV.141: Pāc.71). He is also not to underrate the value of the disciplinary measures agreed upon by the Saṅgha

¹ Pāc. 6, 63-65, 71-73, 76, 77, 79-82

² Vin.IV. 37-39: Pāc. 69 and 70

as being effective and essential for the well-being of the community. (*Yo pana bhikkhu pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadeyya kiṃ paṇimehi khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi yāvadeva kukkucāya vihesāya vilekhāya samvattantiṭi sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake pācittiyaṃ.* Vin.IV.143: Pāc.72). These *sikkhāpada* show that the purpose of the Pātimokkha was not only to safeguard the outward conduct and the moral life of the disciple but also to protect the machinery which was set up to achieve this end.

In the code of the Pātimokkha even the day to day life of the Buddhist monk is circumscribed within certain considerations relating to the articles of daily use such as his bowl and the robe, beds, seats, rugs etc.¹ We notice that on account of certain abuses by monks they were forbidden the use of needle-cases made of bone, ivory and horn. In the evolution of monastic discipline such restrictions become general rules and through the code of the Pātimokkha govern the life of all members of the community. Likewise, the monks are forbidden the use of couches and chairs which are bolstered with cotton on account of the protests that they are like the luxuries enjoyed by laymen.² The use and distribution of what belongs to the

¹ Ibid.167-73: Pāc. 85-92

² Ibid.169

Saṅgha also needed to be done with sufficient caution.¹ Neglect and damage of monastic property and misappropriation of what belongs to the collective organization of the Saṅgha for private ends are safeguarded against. A monk who places for his own use a couch or a chair or a mattress or a stool belonging to the Order in the open air, should either remove it or have it removed on departing, or should inform those concerned of his departure. If he does not do so, there is an offence of expiation - Pācittiya.² It is also stated that a monk who knowingly appropriates for himself or transfers to another individual a benefit which accrues to the Saṅgha is guilty of a breach of discipline. In the former case he is guilty of the more serious offence of Nissaggiya Pācittiya and in the latter of a Pācittiya.³ It is clear from these injunctions that the Pātimokkha also takes cognizance of a considerably settled monastic life.

Of the diverse monastic rituals witnessed in the Khandhakas the Pātimokkha has a few references to the *kaṭhina ubbhāra*, which is closely associated with the ceremony of the *vassāvāsa* or rains-retreat, and these too, are mainly in terms of the

¹ Ibid.39-46, 91, 155f: Pāc.14-18, 41, 82

² Ibid.39

³ Vin.III.265; IV.156

acceptance and use of robes.¹ The *sikkhāpada* deal no more with it. On the other hand, Pācittiya 72 and 73 directly refer to the ritual of the Pātimokkha with a view to eliminate any irregularities and abuses which may occur in connection with the recital of the Pātimokkha.² Saṅghādisesa 12 presupposes the existence of the Pātimokkha under the term *uddesa*. These rules which are contained in the text of the Pātimokkha clearly reveal the scope and function of the Pātimokkha and its recital as an instrument for detecting miscreants in the monastic circles and assisting them in their correction. Therefore we are compelled to observe that these *sikkhāpada* were latterly added to the collection of the Pātimokkha while the recital as a regular observance was acquiring a definite character.

Modelling the life of a monk in terms of the rules of the Pātimokkha marks the shift of accent from *sīla* to *sikkhāpada* as well as the change of responsibility for the maintenance of monastic discipline from the individual monk to the collective organization of the Saṅgha. Even the venerable Upasena Vaṅgantaputta who is distinguished as a forest-dwelling monk devoted to austere ways of living (*ārañṇako piṇḍapātiko paṃsukūliko*) seems to accept, as a member of the general

¹ Vin.III.195-203: Nissaggiya 1-3.

² Vin.IV.143-44.

corpus of the Saṅgha, the code of rules laid down by the Buddha, in its entirety, as the guiding factor in monastic discipline. (*Na mayaṃ apaññattaṃ paññāpessāma paññattaṃ vā na samucchindissāma yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattissāmā'ti. Vin.III.231*). The Buddha heartily endorses this view. *Sādhu sādhu upasena*, says the Buddha in recognition of this attitude. We seem to hear the echo of this in the remarks of the venerable Mahā Kassapa at the First Council where arose the dispute about the abrogation of the minor rules.¹

Thus it is clear that the *sikkhāpada* and the recital of the Pātimokkha are closely connected not only in their literary content but also in their aims and aspirations. Besides, in all the standard definitions of the virtuous monk, the virtue of his *sīla* is always coupled with the restraint he acquires through the discipline of the Pātimokkha and the *sikkhāpada*.² This shows us that from early times in the history of Buddhism all possible criteria have been used for the maintenance of good discipline. In the Ākaṅkheyya Sutta the Buddha requests his disciples to go through this complete course of training which couples together *sīla* and the Pātimokkha. (*Sampannasīlā bhikkhave*

¹ Vin.II.288. See Appendix II.

² M.I.33,355; II.2,134; S.V.187; A. II.14.

*viharatha saṃpanna-pātimokkhā pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvutā
viharatha ācāragocarasampannā anumattesu vajjesu
bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhatha sikkhāpadesu. M.I.33). True
to this tradition, the venerable Ānanda, in his admonitions to the
Sakyan Mahānāma, describes in identical terms a worthy
disciple who is a sīlasampanna. (Idha mahānāma ariyasāvako
sīlavā hoti pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati
ācāragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī
samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu. Evaṃ kho mahānāma
ariyasāvako sīlasampanno hoti. M.I.355)*

CHAPTER IX
The Ritual of the Pātimokkha

An examination of the Pali texts reveals the fact that we are not without Canonical Sutta references which speak of the existence of the Pātimokkha recital even during the lifetime of the Buddha.¹ In the Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, the Buddha himself tells Sakuludāyī Paribbājaka how the solitude of his forest-dwelling monks is regularly interrupted by their attendance at the fortnightly recital of the Pātimokkha in the assembly of the Saṅgha. (*Santi kho pana me udāyi sāvakā āraññakā pantasenāsanā araññavanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni ajjhogahetvā viharanti. Te anvaddhamāsaṃ*

¹ Whether we use the word ritual with reference to this event or not, it is said to have been performed with definite regularity and with a seriousness of purpose which had a religious significance. When we describe the recital as being ritualistic in character it is at the later stage when the spirit of the old *Uddesa* had faded away and the recital had come to be burdened with many technicalities of an external character which have hardly any connection with its earlier aims. In contrast to this we use the word ritual with reference to the Pātimokkha recital from its earliest phase.

saṅghamajjhe osaranti pātimokkhuddesāya. M. II. 8). This is quite an incidental reference and no more is said in the Sutta thereafter about the Pātimokkha ritual.

The Aṅguttara Nikāya records the words of the Vajjiputtaka monk who comes before the Buddha and confesses his inability to discipline himself in terms of the *sikkhāpada* which are being regularly recited in the assembly of the Saṅgha every fortnight (*Atha kho aññataro vajjiputtako bhikkhu yena bhagavā tenupasaṅkami.... Ekamantaṃ nisinno kho so vajjiputtako bhikkhu bhagavantaṃ etad 'avoca. Sādhikaṃ idaṃ bhante diyadḍhasikkhāpadasatam anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchati. Nā'haṃ bhante ettha sakkomi sikkhitun'ti.* A.I.230). But the word Pātimokkha is not used in this context. However, there is no doubt that the *uddesa* here referred to as a fortnightly event is nothing other than what is spoken of elsewhere as the recital of the Pātimokkha (*Pātimokkhuddesa* and *suttuuddesa*). The Vinaya too, uses the term *uddesa* in the sense of the Pātimokkha and its recital. (*Uddesapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesū'ti pātimokkhapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesu.* Vin.III.178).

On the other hand, the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta which comes down to us as a post-parinibbāna composition of fair antiquity, gives us more details regarding the ritual of the

Pātimokkha.¹ According to the Suttta, this ritual seems to have been vital to the early Buddhist monastic community to maintain and establish its purity and exercise control over its miscreants. (*Atthi kho brāhmaṇa tena bhagavatā jānatā arahatā passatā sammāsambuddhena bhikkhūnaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ paññattaṃ pātimokkhaṃ uddiṭṭhaṃ. Te mayaṃ tad'ah'uposathe yāvatikā ekaṃ gāmakkhettaṃ upanissāya viharāma te sabbe ekajjhaṃ sannipatāma sannipatitvā yassa taṃ vattati taṃ ajjhesāma. Tasmin ce bhaññamāne hoti bhikkhussa āpatti hoti vītikkamo taṃ mayaṃ yathādhammaṃ yathāsattaṃ kāremā'ti. Na kira no bhavanto kārenti dhammo no kāretī'ti. M.III.10*). Thus Pātimokkha undoubtedly became the most dynamic institution in the early history of the Sāsana. It also soon roused endless opposition from members of the monastic community on account of its uncompromising spirit of correction and reform. On the other hand, the Pātimokkha ritual itself lost its dynamism in course of time and there is evidence to believe that in its struggle for survival it lent itself to considerable modification.

It is with regret that we note that the translation of the above passage in the Further Dialogues of the Buddha is extremely misleading.

¹ See *supra*, pp. 2, 7.

For the benefit of researchers, we reproduce it here in full.

"Lord who knew and saw, the Arahat all-enlightened, prescribed a rule of life and laid down canon law. Every sabbath all of us who live in the precincts of a village meet as a body and in meeting enquire what each is doing. If, when this is being told us, an offence or a transgression by an Almsman is disclosed, we make him act according to the Doctrine and according to book. It is not by us, we hold, but by the Doctrine that he is constrained." *Further Dialogues* II [SBB.VI], p.160.

We would translate the passage as follows:

"O Brahmin, the Exalted One has laid down *sikkhāpada* and instituted the Pātimokkha for the use of the Bhikkhus. We are the Bhikkhus for whom they were laid down and all of us who live by a single village unit assemble ourselves together on the day of the Uposatha and whosoever amongst us knows it, i.e. the Pātimokkha (*yassa taṃ vattati*), we request him to recite it (*taṃ ajjhesāma*). While it is being recited if (it is discovered that) a Bhikkhu has an offence or a transgression of which he is guilty, then we deal with him (*kārema*) according to the

Dhamma and the injunctions (*yathādhammam yathāsattham*). It is not the monks who punish us but the Dhamma which punishes us"

Sukumar Dutt, in his *The Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, has made use of the translation of this passage in the Further Dialogues of the Buddha which we have referred to above.¹ Dutt has certainly attempted to improve on the choice of words in the translation. He replaces almsman with Bhikkhu, Doctrine with Dhamma and 'according to book' with 'scriptural ordinances'. But these changes do not add any more sense to the translation. If the statement *yassa taṃ vattati taṃ ajjhesāma* of the passage quoted above which we have translated as 'whosoever knows it (Pātimokkha), we request him (to recite it)' still baffles the reader we would refer him to Vin.I.116 where it occurs in a clearer context. (*Te theram ajjhesimsu uddisatu bhante thero pātimokkhan'ti. So evaṃ āha na me āvuso vattatī'ti. Vin.I.116*).

Placed in such a situation, it is not at all surprising that Dutt came to the following conclusion: "The periodical assembly mentioned by Ānanda seems to have been the primitive bond of the Buddhist sect after the extinction of personal leadership on

¹ S. Dutt, *The Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.65f.

the Lord's decease ... It is not known when exactly a disciplinary code ascribed traditionally to the Lord himself, of which the Pātimokkha was the final development, was first devised in the Buddhist community.¹ His theories which resulted from this assumption are examined in the relevant places.

We are compelled to include here [at the stage of this second edition] an equally serious misunderstanding of the Gopakamoggalāna Sutta in the hands of renowned scholars which has led to disastrous conclusions Here is Professor Nalinaksa Dutt.

"Ananda replied. We are not without a refuge (*appaṭisaraṇā*), dhamma is our refuge. There is a treatise called *Pātimokkha* which has been formulated by the omniscient Teacher and which **all the monks living in the same parish (*gāmakkhetta*) have to recite** in a monastery where they assemble on the *uposatha* days. **Should there occur any difference or doubt in the recitation, the bhikkhus present explain them in accordance with the *dhamma*** (hence they have *dhamma* as their refuge)." [Note: Translation errors are highlighted.]. Majjhima, III. pp. 7ff. N. Dutt, Buddhist Sects in India, 1970, p.43 and p.40 in 1998 edition.

¹ Ibid.

We observe further that this is a tragic misunderstanding of the Pali text quoted, specially in the hands of a reputed scholar. The **resulting errors of interpretation** are extremely misleading.

Here are our comments.

"All monks living in the same parish and assembled in a monastery do not recite the *Pātimokkha* on the *uposatha* day. It is not all monks who recite. It is the Reciter [i.e. *Pātimokkhuddesaka*] who recites. Others only listen to him attentively and keep track of what is being recited [*Taṃ sādhukaṃ suṇoma manasi karoma.*]."

There is no reference whatsoever to 'there being any difference or doubt in the recitation'. It is the discovery of any offence committed by a bhikkhu in terms of the *sikkhāpada* recited - *tasmīñ ce bhaññamāne hoti bhikkhussa āpatii hoti bhikkhussa vītikkamo.*

Deriving from his **second wrong assumption above**, the writer makes the following most serious error. He says: "... the bhikkhus present **explain them in accordance with the *dhamma*** (hence they have *dhamma* as their refuge)". This error betrays a complete ignorance of what the function of the

Pātimokkha recital was expected to be. ***Yathādhamma*** means according to **tradition as already laid down**. It is supported by the accompanying phrase ***yathāsattham*** which simply means as instructed.

In the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta, the declaration of the venerable Ānanda to the Brahmin Vassakāra is in answer to the question whether the monastic community was without guidance on the death of the Master who appointed no successor. It is interesting that both in the proper care of the monastic community and the spiritual welfare of its members, it is the Dhamma which embodies the spirit of the Buddha's teaching which Ānanda claims to be their leader and guide (*Na kho mayaṃ brāhmaṇa appaṭisaraṇā sappaṭisaraṇā mayaṃ brāhmaṇa dhammapaṭisaraṇā*. M. III. 9).

This regard and respect which the disciples still seem to have for the Dhamma even after the demise of the Master is reminiscent of the advice given by the Buddha to his disciples in the Kakacūpama Sutta. (*Tasmāt'iha bhikkhave dhammaṃ y'eva sakkaronto dhammaṃ garukaronto dhammaṃ apacāyamānā suvacā bhavissāma sovacassataṃ āpajjissāmā'ti evaṃ hi vo bhikkhave sikkhitabbaṃ* - M.I.126). It also reminds us of his advice to Ānanda in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (*Tasmāt'iha*

*ānanda attadīpā viharatha attasaraṇā anaññasaraṇā dhammadīpā dhammasaraṇā anaññasaraṇā ...Ye hi ke ci ānanda etarahi vā mamaṃ vā accayena attadīpā viharissanti.....anaññasaraṇā tamatagge me te ānanda bhikkhū bhavissanti ye ke ci sikkhākāmā'ti. D.II.100). In both these cases, which on the authority of internal evidence mark a relatively early and a very late stage in the history of the Sāsana, the disciples are advised by the Buddha to be guided by the Dhamma and to respect its leadership. But the increasing need for regulations, with greater concern for the letter of the law, is already evident in the Sutta Piṭaka. We have already witnessed in the Bhaddāli Sutta the introduction of *sikkhāpada* into the sphere of Buddhist monastic discipline.¹ In the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta, Ānanda makes pointed reference to the existence of the *sikkhāpada* as well as of the ritual Pātimokkha.²*

What appears to be the most complete account of the recital of the Pātimokkha occurs in the Uposathakkhandhaka of the Mahāvagga.³ This account, which is very composite in character, including commentarial notes which are of a

¹ M.I.445. See *supra* p.48ff.

² M.III.7

³ Vin.I.101ff.

relatively later date, attempts to place the inauguration of the ritual in a convincing historical situation. It introduces the establishment of the recital of the Pātimokkha through several preliminary stages not all of which seem to be really necessary. This is perhaps the result of the editor of the text following too closely the formulation of *sikkhāpadas* and their modified versions in successive stages in the Suttavibhaṅga where a historical or imaginary situation is provided for every addition or change. It is said that King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha brought to the notice of the Buddha the fact that the Paribbājakas met regularly on the 8th, 14th and 15th days of the fortnight and preached their Dhamma (*dhammaṃ bhāsanti*) as a result of which they gained fame and popularity and grew in strength. So he wished that the disciples of the Buddha, too, did the same.¹

In response to this the Buddha instructed his disciples to meet accordingly, hoping perhaps that they would engage themselves in some religious activity at such assemblies. But we are told that in the absence of specific instructions from the Master they sat in the assembly and remained silent like 'dumb creatures.' However, it is stated that the people were wise enough to remind the disciples that it was their duty to preach

¹ Vin.I.101

the Dhamma when they met (*Nanu nāma sannipatitehi dhammo bhāsitaḥ* Vin.I.102). Thereupon the Buddha recommended that it should be so (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave cātuddase pannarase aṭṭhamiyā ca pakkhassa sannipatitvā dhammaṃ bhāsitaḥ* Ibid.) But it must be mentioned at this stage that the Mahāvagga does not refer to these assemblies of the Buddhist Saṅgha or of the Paribbājakas as Uposatha. They are no more than regular meetings of those who had renounced the household life at which, even the laymen knew, the Dhamma would be preached. The laymen attended those meetings for the purpose of listening to the Dhamma. Nor do we find the term Pātimokkha associated with these meetings. But as a modification to these regular meetings of religious men at which their special doctrines were preached before laymen the Buddha is said to have suggested the idea that his disciples should perform the Pātimokkha recital as a religious duty on the day of the Uposatha. He appears to sanction for this purpose the recital of the body of *sikkhāpada* which he had already laid down for the guidance of his disciples.¹

But the recital of the Pātimokkha assumes a more positive and definite character where it is presented as closely following the promulgation of the *sikkhāpada* in the attempt to arrest the

¹ Ibid.102

decline in monastic discipline. That this was undoubtedly the primary function of the Pātimokkha is clear from the request of the venerable Sāriputta in the Suttavibhaṅga pertaining to the institution of *sikkhāpada* and the recital of the Pātimokkha and from the reply given to him by Buddha.¹ The ritual of the Pātimokkha empowers the collective organization of the Saṅgha, on the authority of the 'dhamma and the instructions' (*yathādhammaṃ yathāsatthaṃ*), to sit in judgement over the conduct of its members.² The *sikkhāpada* of which the text of the Pātimokkha is constituted form the criteria. One should also take note of the procedure adopted by the senior monk (*thera*) who recites the Pātimokkha in the assembly (*pātimokkhuddesaka*) in questioning the members of the assembly with regard to their purity in terms of each group of *sikkhāpada* recited by him. In the light of evidence from the Suttas which we have already examined there does not appear to be any justification to regard this aspect of the Pātimokkha recital as being of later origin.

But Sukumar Dutt calls this 'the present ritual form of the Pātimokkha' and says that it 'was not its original form - the

¹ Vin.III.9

² M.III.10

original was a disciplinary code.¹ Dutt presumes the existence of the 'original Pātimokkha' in the bare form of a code.² He says that the Suttavibhaṅga contemplates it as such, and goes on to add the following remarks: 'In the Suttavibhaṅga there is not the usual word-for-word commentary on the "introductory formular" of the Pātimokkha as we now have it - as text for a ritual.' A few lines below he concludes as follows: 'The Suttavibhaṅga, in fact, regards the Pātimokkha as a mere code, while the Mahāvagga regards it as a liturgy.' But how does one arrive at such a conclusion ? When Dutt speaks of the Pātimokkha as a mere code does he mean that it was not used for the purpose of a recital? Apparently he does so, for the only argument he adduces in support of his thesis is that the Suttavibhaṅga does not provide a word-for-word commentary on the "introductory formlular" of the Pātimokkha which is now used as the introduction to the recital. We should point out here that not only is there no commentary on the "introductory formular" in the Suttavibhaṅga, but the "introductory formular" itself is not found in the Suttavibhaṅga. But this does not prove that the recital of the Pātimokkha was not known to the

¹ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.81.

² See *Ibid.* p.74.

Suttavibhaṅga. On the other hand, the evidence proves the contrary.

At a stage when the true spirit of the Uddesa or the recital of the Pātimokkha was well known there would hardly have been a need for the incorporation of such a formal introduction in the Suttavibhaṅga.¹ Nevertheless, one cannot forget the fact that every *sikkhāpada* in the Suttavibhaṅga is introduced in a manner as though it were intended to be recited: *Evañ ca pana bhikkhave imaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ uddiseyyātha*. On the other hand, the text of the Pātimokkha, which contains only the *sikkhāpada* without any details about them, and which we believe was extracted from the Suttavibhaṅga to serve the needs of the recital, carries this "introductory formular". It is misleading to refer to the Pātimokkha which is known to the Suttavibhaṅga as a mere code. The Suttavibhaṅga knows fully well the functions of the Pātimokkha recital as is evident from Pācittiyas 72 and 73.² The Pātimokkha recital which is known to the Suttavibhaṅga and to some of the Suttas in the Nikāyas is a dynamic function where a close watch is kept over the conduct of the members of the Saṅgha, the miscreants are detected and are dealt with according to the law. If Dutt attaches so much

¹ See M.III.10; Vin.IV.144

² Vin.IV.142 ff.

importance to the negative evidence of the absence of the commentary to the "introductory formular" in the Suttavibhaṅga, then it seems hardly justifiable to pay no attention to the positive evidence which points to a different conclusion.

This being so, where does one find the 'original form' of the Pātimokkha as a 'bare code'? Does one find such a code referred to by the name of Pātimokkha divorced from the confessional meeting of the Uposatha ? What did apparently exist prior to the institution of the recital of the Pātimokkha was the body of *sikkhāpada*. After his remarks on what appears to him to be the form of the Pātimokkha, Dutt proceeds to comment on the Pātimokkha as a monastic function. In his search for the 'missing link' Dutt is prepared to see in the story of Buddha Vipassi in the Mahāpadāna Sutta 'an earlier rite'.¹ This he calls 'the archaic practice among the Buddhists'² and says that the recital of the Pātimokkha replaced it at a comparatively late stage of the growth of the Saṅgha.³

It is also difficult to see how Dutt comes to the conclusion that 'the rudimentary idea in the Buddhist Uposatha service

¹ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.81.

² S. Dutt, *Buddha And Five After-Centuries*, p.76

³ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.81

seems to have been a ritualistic one, - the observance of sacred days'.¹ On the other hand, we have already shown how the Uposatha and the Pātimokkha recital of the Buddhist Saṅgha are closely identified. Besides, we fail to detect the sacredness associated with these `days' which the Buddhist Saṅgha was expected to observe. No matter to whom they were sacred, they were accepted by the Buddhists too, because it was convenient to use for the purpose of religious observances these conventionally recognised days. Further, as is clear from the Mahāvagga, additional religious activities on the part of the Buddhist Saṅgha on these popularly respected days of the moon would have elevated them in the esteem of the people.²

Dutt is obviously making a needless search when he attempts to find a reason for the preaching of the Dhamma by religious mendicants when they meet on those specified days.³ This is what he says:

¹ Ibid.p.82

² Vin.I.101. On the adaptation by the Buddhists of this respect for the 8th, 14th and 15th days of every fortnight see Anguttara Nikāya I.142-45

³ See Vin.I.102

`It is curious to observe the closeness between the Vrata ceremonies of the Vedic sacrificer and the Posadha ceremonies of the Jaina, though the reason, as given in the Satapatha-Brahmaṇa, for such observances has no relevance to Jaina faith. The Jainas retire on these sacred days into their Posadha-sālā, as the Vedic sacrificer would go into the Agnyāgāra, and they take upon themselves the vow of the four abstinences (*Upavāsa*), viz. from eating (*āhāra*), from luxuries (*sarīrasatkāra*), from sexual intercourse (*abrahma*), and daily work (*vyāpāra*). Similar abstinences are prescribed also for Buddhist laymen who celebrate the day of Uposatha by the observance of the Eight Sīlas.'

`Among religious mendicants, however, the custom seems to have been different from that which prevailed among laity. It is another form of sacred day observance that is related of them in Mahāvagga, ii. i. The reason for this different form is not far to seek. The `abstinences' were already implied in the norm of life of the religious mendicant, and some substitute had to be found among them for the Vrata abstinences observed by lay folk. Such substitute was found in religious discourse.¹

¹ S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.83

It should be clear to every student of Buddhism that the abstinenes referred to by Dutt in relation to the *Eight Sīla* are only a continuation of the spirit of abstinence and renunciation which is characteristic of all *sīla* from the five *sīla* of the layman to the major *sīla* of the *pabbajita*. The similarity noted here is only a coincidence and shows nothing in common with the Vrata ceremonies of the Vedic ritualist. Hence one cannot find any basis for this forced remark which is made about religious mendicants that 'some substitute had to be found among them for the Vrata abstinenes observed by lay folk.'

The Gopakamoggallāna Sutta which makes a brief but comprehensive statement about the recital of the Pātimokkha speaks of the 'single village unit' (*ekaṃ gāmakkhettam*) as its proper sphere of operation.¹ The *gāmakkhetta* seems to have served as a convenient unit for the collective organization of the disciples for their monastic activities. The rigid divisions and technicalities of Sīmā which abound in the Mahāvagga² are conspicuous by their absence in the Suttas. Both in the Gopakamoggallāna and the Mahāsakuludāyī Suttas, participation in the ritual of the Pātimokkha, referred to there under the name of Uddesa, is looked upon as a regular duty

¹ M.III.10

² Vin.I.106-11. See Appendix III.

which is voluntarily performed by the members of the monastic community as a collective body. It was looked upon as a ritual which was inseparable from Buddhist monasticism. Participation in it was a legitimate right of the members of the Saṅgha which was withdrawn only on the commission of a Pārājika offence. The following explanation of the term *asaṃvāso*, which refers to the penalty incurred by one who is guilty of a Pārājika offence or for one suspended, makes it abundantly clear: *asaṃvāso'ti saṃvāso nāma ekakammaṃ ekuddeso samasikkhātā eso saṃvāso nāma*. Vin.III.28. This complete and total participation in the Uddesa (*ekuddeso*) also implies the solidarity of the monastic group, in addition to ascertaining and safeguarding its purity (*Samaggo hi saṅgho sammomodamāno avivadamāno ekuddeso phāsu viharati*. Vin.III.172). According to a statement in the Mahāvagga the performance of the Uposatha implies the unity and solidarity of the body of Bhikkhus who are participating in it. (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave samaggānam uposathakamman'ti*. Vin.I.105).

The solidarity which the ritual of the Pātimokkha thus gives to the monastic group seems secondary to the other, perhaps earlier, ideal of the purity of the individual monk and hence of the group as a whole. In the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta the

recital itself is referred to very briefly in non-technical terms.¹ But it has a very definite standpoint with regard to the miscreants in the monastic circles and their prosecution and punishment. It is clear from the evidence of the Vinaya too, that the recital of the Pātimokkha had this end in view. During the recital of the Pātimokkha no monk shall, on grounds of ignorance, claim forgiveness for an offence committed by him, if he had been present at least at two earlier recitals of the Pātimokkha. (... *tañ ce bhikkhuṃ aññe bhikkhū jāneyyuṃ nisinnapubbaṃ iminā bhikkhunā dvikkhattuṃ pātimokkhe uddissamāne ko pana vādo bhiyyo na ca tassa bhikkhuno aññāṇakena mutti atthi yañ ca tattha āpattiṃ āpanno tañ ca yathādhammo kāretabbo ...Vin.IV.144*). He is to be dealt with for the offence according to the law. He is also further guilty of not being alert and attentive during the recital. (... *uttari c'assa moho āropetabbo tassa te āvuso alābhā tassa te dulladdhaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ pātimokkhe uddissamāne na sādhukaṃ atthikatvā manasikarosīti. Idaṃ tasmīṃ mohanake pācittiyaṃ. Vin.IV.144*). Thus he has failed to comply with the requirements of the ritual which are specifically laid down elsewhere. (*Pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi taṃ sabbe'va santā sādhukaṃ suṇoma manasikaroma. Vin.I.103*).

¹ M.III.10

On the other hand, the Mahāvagga gives us an account of the Pātimokkha recital with a far greater concern for details. Procedure assumes here a great deal more of importance. (*Evañ ca pana bhikkhave uddisitabbaṃ. Vyattena bhikkuhnā paṭibalena saṅgho ñāpetabbo. Suṇātu me bhante saṅgho. Ajj'uposatho paṇṇaraso. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyya pātimokkhaṃ uddiseyya. Kiṃ saṅghassa pubbakiccaṃ. Pārisuddhim āyasmanto ārocetha. Pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi. Taṃ sabbe'va santā sādhukaṃ suṇoma manasikaroma. Yassa siyā āpatti so āvikareyya. Asantiyā āpattiyā tuṇhī bhavitabbaṃ. Tuṇhībhāvena kho panāyasmante parisuddhā'ti vedissāmi. Vin.I.102).*

The recital of the Pātimokkha must first be formally proposed before the assembly of the Saṅgha. In the absence of any objections from the members of the congregation the approval of the Saṅgha is assumed and the Pātimokkha-reciter commences the recital. It is on behalf of the Saṅgha that he does so and his action is made to be representative of the wish of the Saṅgha. The Pātimokkha-reciter announces that he is ready to commence the recital. However, he identifies himself with the whole group in the performance of the ritual. In the Kaṅkhāvitaranī, Buddhaghosa attempts to safeguard against a

possible misinterpretation of the phrase *pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi* which occurs in the Mahāvagga.¹ It could be argued that the Pātimokkha-reciter would be excluded thereby from active participation in the ritual on the grounds that he is conducting the ceremony and is therefore outside it. But as pointed out earlier the recital of the Pātimokkha is a ritual to be undertaken and performed by all members of the Saṅgha living within a specified area.² Therefore participation in it, either by being personally present or in absentia, was incumbent on every monk (*Ettha ca kiñcā'pi pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi'ti vuttattā suṇoṭha manasikarothā'ti vattuṃ yuttaṃ viya dissati. Saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyyā'ti iminā pana na sameti. Samaggassa hi saṅghassa etaṃ uposathakaraṇaṃ. Pātimokkuddesako ca saṅghapariyāpanno'va. Iccassa saṅghapariyāpannattā suṇoma manasikaromā'it vattuṃ yuttaṃ. Kkvt.14*).

The Mahāvagga has also a few remarks concerning the preliminaries to be observed by the Saṅgha before the Pātimokkha-reciter commences the recital (*Kiṃ sanghassa pubbakiccaṃ. Pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha. Pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi. Vin.I.102*). Strangely enough, the old commentary

¹ Kkvt.14

² M.III.10

which is appended to the text has no comment whatsoever on these ideas of preliminary duties which the Saṅgha is called upon to perform. The atatement which requires the declaration of purity - *Pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha* - does not get a single word of comment. On the other hand, it picks up such words as *āyasmanto* for comment. The Samantapāsādikā too, makes no comment at all on any of the details of procedure given in the Mahāvagga, although it elaborates on a few ideas picked out from the Old Commentary.¹ However, the Kaṅkhāvitaranī explains *kim saṅghassa pubbakiccaṃ* as an inquiry made by the Pātimokkha-reciter before commencing the recital as to whether the preliminary duties to be performed by the Saṅgha had been done (*Kim taṃ katan'ti pucchati*. Kkvt.11). It further explains these duties with the aid of both Canonical texts and commentaries (*Kim saṅghassa pubbakiccan'ti saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyyā'ti evaṃ uposathakaraṇasambandhena vuttassa saṅghassa uposathe kattabbe yaṃ taṃ anujānāmi bhikkhave uposathāgāraṃ sammajjitun'ti ādinā nayena pāliyaṃ āgataṃ aṭṭhakathāsu ca*

Sammajjanī padīpo ca udakaṃ āsanena ca

uposathassa etāni pubbakaraṇan'ti vuccati.

Chandapārisuddhi utukkhānaṃ bhikkhugaṇanā ca

¹ VinA.V.1034f.

ovādo

uposathassa etāni pubbakiccan'ti vuccati.

Evaṃ dvīhi nāmehi navavidhaṃ pubbakiccaṃ dassitaṃ.

Kkvt.10f.).

We notice here that Buddhaghosa, following the earlier commetarial tradition, takes the Canonical statement *anujānāmi bhikkhave uposathāgāraṃ sammajjituṃ...*¹ to mean the preliminary duties incumbent on the Saṅgha who are participating in the recital of the Pātimokkha. But as we examine these directions in their context we notice that this preparation of the venue of the recital constitutes the preliminary duties to be undertaken and supervised by the monks who act the host for the occasion. What is given there as most binding is that no junior monk shall, except in case of illness, fail to execute these duties when ordered to do so by a senior monk. The failure to do so results in a Dukkaṭṭa offence. It is in the same spirit that these preliminary duties (*pubbakaraṇāni*) are recommended to a monk who is the sole occupant of a monastery to prepare for the Uposatha with the hope that other monks will arrive on the scene.² It is here, in

¹ Vin.I.118

² Ibid.125

commenting on this that Buddhaghosa incorporates in the Samanatapāsādikā the commentarial tradition which he inherits from the Aṭṭhakathācariyā regarding these preliminaries.¹ Thus one cannot fail to take note of this discrepancy. A later tradition, however, tries to explain how these preliminary duties, though performed by an individual, come to be reckoned as the lot of the Saṅgha: *Navavidhaṃ pubbakiccaṃ therena ānattena katattā saṅghena kataṃ nāma hoti.*²

On the other hand, *chandapārisuddhi* which is mentioned in the second list of preliminary duties known as *pubbakicca* occupies a place of real importance in the early history of the ritual. As the innocence of every member was tested during the recital in the full assembly of the Saṅgha and the miscreants were punished, the presence of every member who belongs to that assembly was absolutely essential. We use the word assembly here to mean the totality of the disciples who live within the formally accepted region of *samāna sīmā* or common communal activity. The Suttas depict such a region as a very natural division of residence like a village (... *yāvatikā ekaṃ gāmakkhettaṃ upanissāya viharāma te sabbe ekajjhaṃ*

¹ VinA.V.1063

² *Bhikkhupātimokkhagaṇṭhidīpani*, p. 6. A Pali work ascribed to a Thera Nānakitti and printed in Ceylon in 1889.

sannipatāma... M.III.10). However, with the expansion of community life the use of such natural divisions would have become impracticable. Thus we find in the Mahāvagga the origin of a formally accepted region of such co-residence or *ekāvāsa*.¹ Through a Saṅghakamma such a unit of communal activity is demarcated and agreed upon by the Saṅgha. Under the injunctions of the Vinaya no monk shall fail to co-operate for the perfect execution of this arrangement except under the pain of a Dukkata (*Na tv'eva vaggena saṅghena uposatho kātabbo. Yo kareyya āpatti dukkaṭassa.* Vin.I.108, 120). We notice a very rigid ritualistic interpretation of this principle at Vin.I.122. There it is deemed possible to give validity to the Uposathakamma by removing the non-participating monk temporarily out of the region of common communal activity which has been designated as the *sīmā* (*līgha tumhe āyasmanto imaṃ bhikkhuṃ nissīmaṃ netha yāva saṅgho uposathaṃ karotīti.* Vin.I.122).

Under normal conditions the ritual could not be carried out or would be considered ineffective in the absence of even one member. This, in fact, seems to have been the accepted position in the early days of the Buddhist Saṅgha.² The Buddha

¹ Vin.I.106. See also Appendix III.

² Ibid.I.120.

once ordered the monks to assemble so that the Saṅgha might collectively perform the Uposatha. Then it was brought to his notice that one monk was absent from the assembly on account of illness. The Buddha decreed on this occasion that any monk who absents himself from the assembly should convey his innocence to the members of that assembly (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave gilānena bhikkhunā pārisuddhiṃ dātuṃ*. Vin.1.120). He further indicated different ways in which it could be done. Here he definitely insisted that any performance of the ritual without the full assembly or without ascertaining the purity of the absentee members of the Saṅgha would not only be invalid but would also be a definite offence (*Na tv 'eva vaggena saṅghena uposatho kātabbo. Kareyya ce āpatti dukkaṭassa*. Vin.I.120). This act of legislation is further proof of the fact that ascertaining and establishing the purity of the members of the Saṅgha, both present as well as absent, was the major function of the Pātimokkha recital.

Once the assembly of the Saṅgha has met in full membership for the recital of the Pātimokkha and the preliminary duty of communicating the purity and the consent of the absentees has been performed, the Pātimokkha-reciter proceeds thereafter with the recital. According to the statement

in the Suttas the miscreants in the monastic circle were discovered and punished during this recital.¹ The text of the Pātimokkha too, reveals the fact that the purity of the monks was tested and established during the recital and that disciplinary action was also taken against the transgressing monks at the same time (*Tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū anācāraṃ ācaritvā aññāṇakena āpannā'ti jānantū'ti pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadenti idān'eva kho mayaṃ jānāma ayam'pi kira dhammo suttāgato suttapariyāpanno anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgaccha'ti ... na ca tassa bhikkhuno aññāṇakena mutti atthi yañ ca tattha āpattiṃ āpanno tañ ca yathādhammo kāretabbo ...Vin.IV.144).*

It is also clear that the testing was done in terms of each group of *sikkhāpada* after its recital. The monks are called upon to confess if they have violated any of the said rules under each group (*Uddi'thā kho āyasmanto cattāro pārājikā dhammā yesaṃ bhikkhu aññataraṃ vā aññataraṃ vā āpajjitvā na labhati bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ yathā pure tathā pacchā pārājiko hoti asaṃvāso. Tatthā'yasmante pucchāmi kacci'ttha parisuddhā dutiyam ... tatiyaṃ ... parisuddhā. Parisuddhā etth'āyasmanto. Tasmā tuṅhī. Evametaṃ dhārayāmī'ti.*

¹ M.III.10

Vin.III.109).¹ All these accounts seem to agree on the point that the confession of guilt and the establishment of the purity of the members of the congregation as well as the punishment of the offenders were carried out at the assembly which met fortnightly for the recital of the Pātimokkha.

The Mahāvagga account of the Pātimokkha recital categorically states that during the recital all members of the congregation should listen attentively to it and ponder over its contents and whosoever discovers himself to be guilty of any transgression should confess the same before the Saṅgha.² This regular scrutiny would have served to ensure the purity of individual monks and also would have kept the community of monks as a whole above suspicion, as the innocence of every member in terms of the code of monastic discipline was tested in the assembly and the purity of the Saṅgha was thus established (*Pātimokkham uddisissāmi. Taṃ sabbe'va santā sādhuḥkam suṇoma manasikaroma. Yassa siyā āpatti so āvikareyya. Asantiyā āpattiyā tuṇhī bhavitabbaṃ. Tuṇhībhāvena kho pana āyasmante parisuddhā'ti vedissāmi.* Vin.I.103f.).

¹ See also Vin.III.186, 194, 266; IV.174, 184, 206

² Vin.I.103

Yet another, and a very distinctly different function of this ritual is envisaged in the Mahāvagga. It appears that the confession of guilt, if any, by the monks during the recital of the Pātimokkha is insisted upon not only because no miscreant should go unpunished for his offence and thereby help to perpetuate such offences, but also because this confession is said to bring about the disburdening of the offender of the sense of guilt without which no spiritual progress could be made. The Mahāvagga states that this absolution through confession is essential as a prelude to all spiritual attainments (*Tasmā saramānena bhikkhunā āpannena visuddhāpekkhena santi āpatti āvikātabbā. Āvikatā hi 'ssa phāsu hoti. Vin.I.103*). In the ritual of the Pātimokkha, it is evidently this role of 'the purge from guilt' (*āvikatā hi'ssa phāsu hoti*) which earned for itself the title of Pātimokkha, and perhaps through this the text too, which is recited at the ritual of the Uposatha came to be known by the same name.¹ The confession removes the sense of guilt from standing as an impediment on the path to higher spiritual attainment (*Āvikatā hi'ssa phāsu hotī 'ti kissa phāsu hoti.*

¹ Rhys Davids and Oldenberg seem to find further support for this idea through an etymological analysis of the words Pātimokkha and Prātimokṣa. See *Vinaya Texts* I. [SBE..XIII], p.xxvii f.

Paṭhamassa jhānassa adhiḡamāya ... kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ adhiḡamāya phāsu hotīti - Ibid.104).

However, the virtue of confession cannot be in the mere act of owning one's guilt. We should really seek it in the acceptance of penalties and punishments by the offender and in his determination to abstain from the repetition of such offences in the future (*āyati saṃvarāya*). It is also declared by the Buddha both in the Suttas and in the Vinaya that the ability to admit and accept one's error and make amends for it as well as safeguard against its recurrence is the basis of progress (*Vuddhi hi esā bhikkhave ariyassa vinaye yo accayaṃ accayato disvā yathādhammaṃ paṭikaroti āyatiṃ saṃvaramṃ āpajjati*. Vin.I.315).¹ That this attitude to crime and its correction was not restricted to monastic discipline alone is clear from the Buddha's advice to king Ajātasatthu in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta.² The Vinaya too, records a similar incident where the Buddha advises the man, who being instigated by Devadatta, lay in ambush to assassinate him.³ This comprehensive process of confession, however, seems to have undergone considerable change in the history of the Pātimokkha recital.

¹ See also D.I.85; M.I.440; III.247; Vin.II.192

² D.I.85

³ Vin.II.192

It is interesting to note that we discover, both in the Suttas and in the Vinaya, a tendency on the part of some transgressing monks to suppress and conceal any lapses in discipline into which they have slipped (□*hānaṃ kho pan'etaṃ āvuso vijjati yaṃ idh'ekaccassa bhikkhuno evam icchā uppajjeyya āpattiñ ca vata āpanno assaṃ na ca maṃ bhikkhū jāneyyumuṃ*. M.I.27). The fear and dislike of consequent punishment and loss of personal reputation may be considered as being responsible for this. There also seem to have been others who, though their guilt was known to fellow members and they themselves were willing to admit it, wished that they might not be prosecuted in public (*Anuraho maṃ bhikkhū codeyyumuṃ no saṅghamajjhe*. Ibid.).

The Posadhasthāpanavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya records an incident which reflects this tendency.¹ A monk objects to the declaration of his guilt before the whole assembly by the Pātimokkha-reciter and adds that it would have been best done in private. It is also stated there that the Buddha sanctioned this request. (*Sthavira prātimokṣasūtroddeśamuddiśeti. Sa kathayati. Āyuṣmannapariśuddhā tāvadbhikṣuṣaṃsat. Sthavira ko' trāpariśuddhah. Tvameva tāvat. Sthavira kathaṃ nāma tvayā*

¹ *Gilgit MSS.III.3.p.107f.*

saṅghamadhye mama śirasī muṣṭir nipātītā. Aho vatā'ham tvayā ekānte coditah syām'iti. Sa tuṣṇīmavasthitah. Etatprakaraṇaṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti. Bhagavānāha. Ekānte codayitavyo na saṅghamadhye. Gilgit MSS.III.3. 107 f.).

It is clear from evidence in the Pali Vinaya too, that there was opposition to prosecution and disciplinary action from certain individuals and groups in the monastic community (*Sace ime vinaye pakataññuno bhavissanti amhe yen'icchakaṃ yad'icchakaṃ yāvad'icchakaṃ ākaḍḍhissanti parikaḍḍhissanti. Handa mayaṃ āvuso vinayaṃ vivaṇṇemā'ti. Vin.IV.143. Also: Bhikkhu pan'eva dubbacajātiko hoti uddesapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesu bhikkhūhi sahadhammikaṃ vuccamāno attānaṃ avacanīyaṃ karoti mā maṃ kiñ ci avacuttha kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā aham'pi āyasmante na kiñ ci vakkhāmi kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā. Viramathā 'yasmanto mama vacanāyā'ti. Vin.III.178).*¹ Therefore, even where the members of the

¹ Further, the Mahāvagga records the state of affairs of a time when disciplinary action against offenders had to be taken after careful consideration of the temperament and mood of the offenders. For they were not only capable of openly expressing their resentment but were also bold enough even to threaten bodily harm to the prosecuting members. (*Tena kho pana samayena pesalā bhikkhū chabbaggiye bhikkhū okāsaṃ kārapetvā āpattiyā codenti. Chabbaggiyā bhikkhū*

Saṅgha were physically present at the Pātimokkha recital, compelled by the regulations which required them to be present there, yet the miscreants could be non-co-operative in not admitting their transgressions when called upon to do so (*Yo pana bhikkhu yāvataṭṭhiyaṃ anussāviyamāne saramāno santīṃ āpattīṃ na āvikareyya*. Vin.I.103). This would completely nullify the purpose of the recital where the purity of the Saṅgha is assumed by their silence (*Tuṅhībhāvena kho pana āyasmante parisuddhā'ti vedissāmi*. Vin.I.103). Consequently the purity of the Saṅgha which is thus assumed would be far from being real.

In an attempt to steer clear of such a situation special emphasis has been laid on the honesty and integrity of the participants. Wilful suppression of a transgression of which one is guilty is deemed a serious offence hindering one's spiritual progress (*Sampajānamusāvādo kho panāyasmanto anatarāyiko dhammo vutto bhagavatā*. Vin.I.103f.). These words of warning seem to have been uttered regularly at the Uposatha as a prelude to the recital of the Pātimokkha.¹ It is

labhanti āghātaṃ labhanti appaccayaṃ vadhena tajjenti. Bhagavato etamatthaṃ ārocesuṃ. Anujānāmi bhikkhava kate'pi okāse puggalaṃ tulayitvā āpattiyā codetun'ti. Vin.I.114).

¹ Vin.I.103. See also Kkvt.16

also laid down in the laws of the Pātimokkha that it is an offence involving expiation to help a fellow-member to conceal from the Saṅgha a grave offence, i.e. a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa, which he has committed (*Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhussa jānaṃ duṭṭhullaṃ āpattiṃ paṭicchādeyya pācittiyaṃ*. Vin.IV.127).

We also notice in the Khandhakas what appears to be the development of a new tradition regarding the recital of the Pātimokkha. It is stated in the Mahāvagga that the Buddha has decreed that no monk who is guilty of any transgression should perform the Uposatha (*Bhagavatā paññattaṃ na sāpattikena uposatho kātabbo'ti*. Vin.I.125). In the Cullavagga it is reaffirmed that such a monk should not listen to the recital of the Pātimokkha (*Na ca bhikkhave sāpattikena pātimokkhaṃ sotabbaṃ*. Vin.II.240). Both these injunctions, in practice, really serve the same purpose as is clear from the following statement which identifies the Uposatha with the recital of the Pātimokkha: *Sammatāya vā bhikkhave bhūmiyā nisinnā asammatāya vā yato pātimokkhaṃ suṇāti kato' v'assa uposatho*. Vin.I.108. Both these statements evidently derive their authority from the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha in the Cullavagga.¹

¹ Ibid.II.226ff. See Appendix I

This brings us to a very paradoxical position. The Mahāvagga tells us in its details regarding the Pātimokkha recital that any monk in the assembly who is guilty of an offence and who remembers it during the recital should make it known. By the failure to do so he shall incur the further guilt of deliberate lying (*Yo pana bhikkhu yāvatatiyaṃ anussāviyamāne saramāno santim āpattim n'āvikareyya sampajānamusāvād'assa hoti*. Vin.I.103). However, at Vin.I.126 the Bhikkhu who recollects during the recital of the Pātimokkha an offence which he has committed seems to be at a loss as to what he should do. He seems to be put into a very dilemmatic position by the apparently subsequent legislation that no guilty monk should participate in the Pātimokkha recital (*Tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu pātimokkhe uddissamāne āpattim sarati. Atha kho tassa bhikkhuno etadahosi bhagavatā paññattaṃ na sāpattikena uposatho kātabbo'ti. Ahañ c'amhi āpattim āpanno kathan nu kho mayā paṭipajjitabban'ti*. Vin.I.126).

On the other hand, side by side with this exclusion of a guilty monk from the recital of the Pātimokkha it is also insisted on that no monk should let the performance of his Uposatha lapse (*Na tv'eva tappaccayā uposathassa antarāyo kātabbo*. Vin.I.126f.). Even a monk who on account of illness is unable to be physically present at the ritual was expected to communicate

to the Saṅgha his purity so that it may be declared in the assembly before the recital.¹ For it is the purity of all members concerned which is to be ascertained and established at this fortnightly congregation of the Saṅgha. Therefore it could not be properly performed in the absence of even one member of the group if the Saṅgha had not been authoritatively informed of his purity prior to the recital. It is even suggested that a sick monk who has been unable to communicate his purity to the Saṅgha may be conveyed in a bed or a seat before the assembly for the valid performance of the ritual.² If he is too ill to be moved without danger to his life, the Saṅgha is then called upon to go to him and perform the Uposatha there lest they be guilty of a ritual of incomplete membership.³

Thus we see the very dilemmatic position in which a guilty monk is placed in the light of the ruling that no guilty monk has the right to listen to the Pātimokkha or perform the Uposatha and the injunction that no monk shall fail to perform the Uposatha. This would first eliminate the possibility of a guilty monk who could suppress his guilt and sit silently through the recital of the Pātimokkha. Secondly, such a monk, on that

¹ Ibid.I.120

² Vin.I.120

³ Ibid.

account, could not also keep out of the Uposatha. The only solution that seems to be offered to this compels the monk to confess his guilt to another beforehand. Prior to his attendance at the ritual the guilty monk is expected to go before a fellow member and submit very respectfully that he is guilty of a specific offence and that he wishes to admit it.¹ On his admission of guilt and his being advised to safeguard against its recurrence the guilty monk gains absolution which entitles him to participate in the ritual. Thus we feel that confession of one's guilt prior to participation in the ritual was necessitated by the exclusion of guilty monks from the ritual of the Pātimokkha.²

From what we have indicated it should be clear that confession of the type contemplated here does not absolve an offender from the guilt of a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa. Nevertheless we are told that this form of confession gives an offender sufficient purity to enable him to participate in the ritual.³ Hence we are compelled to observe that what is conceded here is, more or less, a ritualistic purge. On the other hand, it seems to offer to the transgressing monks complete shelter from public scrutiny to which they would have ben

¹ Ibid.I.126

² Ibid.II.240

³ Ibid.I.125f.

subjected if they had to confess their guilt at the time of the recital. For now the confession may be made before a group or even a single individual who may possibly be selected on partisan loyalties.¹ Thus it may be argued that this form of private confession prior to the recital was intended to remove the alleged harshness of the jurisdiction of the Pātimokkha ritual.

Certain incidents which are referred to in the Cullavagga, in the chapter on the Suspension of the Pātimokkha, seem to indicate the fact that there were certain members in the monastic community who were so rebellious in character that they did not choose to make use of this concession. That alone would account for the presence of the Chabbaggiyā as guilty monks (*sāpattika*) at the recital of the Pātimokkha.² The Suspension of the Pātimokkha would then appear to serve the purpose of dealing effectively with such miscreants who tend to break the law flagrantly at every turn.

We discover that through the act of suspending the Pātimokkha the ritual of the Pātimokkha comes to acquire a new emphasis. Any member of the Pātimokkha assembly who

¹ Ibid. See also Ibid.I.103

² Ibid.II.241. See also Ibid.I.125f.

knows through seeing, hearing or suspicion (*diṭṭhena sutena parisāṅkhāya*) about the commission of an offence by any participant would, on seeing that individual, declare it in the assembly and call for the suspension of his Pātimokkha, which in effect means that the Pātimokkha shall not be recited in his company.¹ In spite of all the taboos and restrictions relating to the recital of the Pātimokkha which are indicated in the Vinaya Piṭaka, the possibility is here contemplated of the presence of a Pārājika offender in the assembly which meets to recite the Pātimokkha.² It is also declared possible that there may be offenders in terms of all the seven groups of Āpatti. Nevertheless, in all these cases, the detection and chastisement of offenders take place, if ever at all, not through voluntary confession during the recital of the Pātimokkha but through report and other indirect sources of information with which the Saṅgha has been acquainted, and that too, prior to the recital with a view to denying them the right of participation in it.

However, the ritualistic purge from guilt, resulting from confession at and before the recital, became a reality in the history of Buddhist monasticism. The Vimativinodanī records

¹ Ibid. II.244

² Ibid.

the view of some section of the monastic community who actually maintained that even the greater offences were remedied by mere confession. But the author goes on to point out that this view is completely at variance with the text of the Pātimokkha which prescribes penalties for the greater offences (*Āvikatā hi'ssa phāsu hotī'ti vuttattā garukāpatti'pi āvikaraṇamattena vuṭṭhātī'ti keci vadanti. Taṃ tesam matimattam parivāsādividhānasuttehi virujjhanato. Ayaṃ pan'ettha adhippāyo. Yathābhūtam hi attānaṃ āvikarantaṃ pesalaṃ bhikkhuṃ akāmā parivatthabban'ti ādivacanaṃ nissāya anicchamānaṃ'pi naṃ upāyena parivāsādi dāpetvā anassaṃ suddhante patiṭṭhapessanti. Tato tassa avippaṭisārādīnaṃ vasena phāsu hoti. Vimt.396*).

It is clear, however, that the changing outlook and the concessions made in the sphere of monastic discipline led to this position. We see here an attempt to extract a new concession from the old idea of confession of guilt at the Pātimokkha recital which included payment of penalties besides confession. The reduction of the ritual of the Pārimokkha to a mere confession for the sake of absolution was undoubtedly a sectarian move as pointed out in the Vimativinodanī.

But we discover that some scholars have mistaken this aspect of confession to be the original concept in early Buddhist

monasticism. There is clear evidence that Sukumar Dutt did not fully appreciate the scope of confession of guilt by the Buddhist disciples.¹ This has resulted from the incorrect translations of two Pali passages which he quotes. His first quotation (Cullavagga,v.20.5) suffers on two accounts. Firstly, it is mutilated in that a vital portion of the quotation - *vuddhi hi esā* - has been left out. Dutt also seems to lose sight of another important condition governing this confession. It is the reminder to the transgressing monk regarding future restraint which is part and parcel of this process of confession and self-correction (*āyatim saṃvareyyāsi*. Vin.II.102: *āyatim saṃvaram āpajjati*. Ibid.126). Secondly, these omissions made the rest of the quotation meaningless and drove the translator to force a garbled meaning out of it. Hence this translation: 'In these Rules laid down by the Venerable One, he who realises his lapse to be such and remedies it according to law, obtains absolution at once.' But we regret to say that there is no notion of absolution whatsoever here. How far from the real state of affairs would it be to say 'he ... absolution at once.' In the second quotation he gives the translation 'Unconfessed offences are cleared up on confession' for the phrase *āvikatā hi'ssa phāsu hoti*. Here too, we fail to detect any indication of the 'clearance of an offence.'

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.85

Based on this mistaken notion of absolution through confession, Dutt assumes that there was in the early days of the Sāsana `a mere religious confession which led to absolution from the guilt confessed.'¹ This, he would have us believe, was the earlier aspect of the Pātimokkha ritual. However, he is quick to detect the dynamic function of what he calls the legal confession. Its importance is equally admitted by him. For he says: `The incorporation of the concept of legal confession with the code was a necessity, as without it most parts of the code would remain inoperative and disciplinary proceedings could not be taken. Hence emphasis is laid on the duty of confession.'² It is for these same reasons, as we have already pointed out, that confession and punishment became the essential core of the earliest Pātimokkha ritual. The text of the Pātimokkha too, which has a better claim to be more authentic than the Mahāvagga, records in Pācittiya 73 evidence to the effect that if a monk is discovered during the fortnightly recital of the Pātimokkha to be guilty of a transgression, charges are to be framed and disciplinary action taken against him.³

¹ Ibid.p.86

² Ibid.p.86f.

³ Vin.IV.144

At the same time, it is also clear that if a guilty monk could not take part in the ritual because of his guilt and he therefore absolves himself of it through confession prior to his attendance at the ritual, then no participant would really be guilty of any Āpatti of which he could confess during the recital. But the ritual of the Pātimokkha in its early phase countenanced the presence of both innocent and guilty monks (*Yassa siyā āpatti so āvikareyya asantiyā āpattiyā tuṅhī bhavitabbaṃ*. Vin.I.103. Also: *Tasmiñ ce bhaññamāne hoti bhikkhussa āpatti hoti vītikamo*. M.III.10.).¹ As far as we could infer, the phrase *asantiyā āpattiyā* which occurs in the Mahāvagga side by side with *yassa siyā āpatti*, should really mean complete absence of guilt. But the Mahāvagga itself, which appears to have recognised and accepted the new turn of the ritual, explains *asantī āpatti* in keeping with the new tradition of absolution through prior confession (*asantī nāma āpatti anajjhāpannā vā āpajjitvā vā vuṭṭhitā*. Vin.I.103). The Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī subscribes to the same view and maintains that an *āpatti* which has been declared and accepted really amounts to no *āpatti* (*Asantiyā āpattiyā'ti yassa pana evaṃ anāpannā vā āpattiṃ āpajjitvā ca puna vuṭṭhitā vā desitā vā ārocitā vā āpatti tassa sā āpatti asantī nāma hoti*. Kkv.15). What purpose does it serve then to

¹ See Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p.373. n.1

say as an introduction to the recital that any one who is guilty of an offence shall confess it during the recital? For no monk, according to this latter tradition, who is guilty of an Āpatti could be present at the recital. Has not this statement in the Mahāvagga, *yassa siyā āpatti so āvikareyya*, already lost its original significance and does it not appear as a mere fossil embedded in the old formula?

A similar significant deviation from what we would consider to be the older tradition is noticeable under the *pubbakicca* or preliminary duties which needed to be performed before the recital of the Pātimokkha. The Mahāvagga which describes the ritual of the Pātimokkha recital introduces what it considers to be the preliminary duty to be performed before the commencement of the recital in the following words: 'What is the preliminary duty of the Saṅgha? Let the venerable ones inform the purity.' (*Kiṃ saṅghassa pubbakiccaṃ. Pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha. Vin.I.102*).³ Elsewhere in the Mahāvagga, the joint communication of *chanda* (consent) and *pārisuddhi* (purity) of those who are unable to be present at the recital is given as a general condition to be fulfilled before the assembly which meets for the recital of the Pātimokkha.¹ The inclusion of *chanda* here is said to be done on the assumption

¹ See Ibid.p.372.n.1

that the Saṅgha might have besides the recital of the Pātimokkha other monastic duties for the performance of which the unanimous agreement of the Saṅgha was needed (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave tad'ah'uposathe pārisuddhiṃ dentena chandam'pi dātuṃ santi saṅghassa karaṇīyan'ti*. Vin.I.122).

In the context of this passage it is manifestly clear that the *pārisuddhi* which is communicated to the assembly of the Pātimokkha recital is that of the absentee monks. Therefore we would have to take the earlier statement *pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha* to mean the announcement of the purity of the absentees, i.e. the members who have assembled for the recital should announce before the Saṅgha any information they have regarding the purity of the absentees who are expected to convey it through a competent fellow member (*pārisuddhi-hāraka*). For the Pātimokkha recital, this information more than the *chanda*, is of vital consideration. However, we notice that the Mahāvagga gives no explanation whatsoever about this phrase *pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha* even in the portion of the text which is regarded as the Old Commentary. On the other hand, Buddhaghosa hastens to explain this with the comment *attano parisuddha-bhāvaṃ ārocetha*.¹ This makes the purity which is announced before the commencement of the

¹ Vin.I.120f. Kkvt.14

recital to be that of the monks present. But what we have shown so far from internal evidence in the Mahāvagga points to the contrary. It is difficult to say with any certainty whether during the time of Buddhaghosa the practice of communicating to the Pātimokkha assembly the purity of the absentee monks had gone out of vogue. What is more clearly evident is the fact that the ritualistic significance of the purity of the participants at the Pātimokkha recital had assumed overwhelming authority. It is in the light of this new change that Buddhaghosa offers the above comment. For he supports it with a statement which he has picked up from the Cullavagga which bars a guilty monk from participating in the Pātimokkha recital (*Na bhikkhave sāpattikena pātimokkhaṃ sotabbaṃ yo suṇeyya āpatti dukkaṭassā'ti vacanato aparisuddhehi pātimokkhaṃ sotuṃ na vaṭṭati. Tena vuttaṃ pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmī'ti. Kvt.14*).¹

But our assumption which is based on co-ordinated evidence from the Vinaya that what should mean here is 'the communication of the purity of the absentees' appears to be further supported by the Vinaya traditions of other schools besides the Theriya. On a careful scrutiny of the Vinaya texts of several other schools which are preserved both in Sanskrit and

¹ See also Vin.II.240

Chinese we discover that they all seem to agree with us in this interpretation of the declaration of purity at the Pātimokkha recital. They specifically state that it is the purity of the absentees which is declared, as a preliminary duty, for the information of the members of the assembly. The Poṣadhavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, which agrees for the most part with the Uposathakkhandhaka of the Mahāvagga, contains a very clear and definite statement on this point (*Yadā saṅghasthavirah kathayati anāgamanāya āyuṣmantas chandaṃ ca pārisuddhiṃ ca ārocayata ārocitaṃ ca pravedayate'ti. Tena antarikasya bhikṣoh puratah sthitvā vaktavyaṃ. Samanvāhara āyuṣman amusmin 'n 'āvāse bhikṣur ābādhiko dukkhito vāḍhaglānah. Adya saṅghasya poṣadhapaṃcadaśikā tasyā'pi bhikṣoh poṣadhapaṃcadaśikā. So'yam evaṃnāmā bhikṣuh pariśuddham āntarāyikaih dharmair'ātmānaṃ vedayati poṣadhe'sya pariśuddhim ārocayāmi ārocitāṃ ca pravedayāmi.* Gilgit MSS. III.4.p.100).

According to the above statement the Pātimokkha-reciter addresses the members of the assembly and makes a clear request to announce before the Saṅgha the purity and the consent of the absentees. Whosoever in the assembly has chosen to play the role of messenger to carry to the Saṅgha the *pārisuddhi* on behalf of an absentee, he shall make it known to the Saṅgha that the absentee has intimated that he is pure and

is not guilty of any transgressions which are detrimental to his religious life: *parisuddhaṃ antarāyikāh dharmairātmānaṃ vedayati*. In the above passage *anāgamanāya* stands for 'the absence from the assembly of possible participants'. That it is so is further supported by the statement in the Prātimokṣasūtra of the same school which in its comments on the preliminary duties uses the very specific term *anāgatānāṃ* which means 'of those who are not present.' (*Kim bhagavatah śrāvakaśaṅghasya pūrvakāla-karaṇīyaṃ alpo 'rtho 'lpakṛtyaṃ. Anāgatānāṃ āyuṣmantaś chandapārisuddhiṃ c' ārocayata ārocitaṃ ca pravedayata*. IHQ.vol.XXIX.2.167). The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāśaṅghikas too, states the same under its instructions for the Prātimokṣa recital (*Anāgatānāṃ āyuṣmanto bhikṣunācchanda-pārisuddhimārocetha. Ārocitañ ca prativedetha* - Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute, vol.X. Appendix, p. 3). The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya which is preserved to us in Chinese expresses the same idea of communicating to the assembly of the Saṅgha the purity and the consent of the absentees before the commencement of the Pātimokkha recital.¹

In the light of all this evidence we feel inclined to infer that this is the true spirit and the older sense in which the statement

¹ *Taisho*, Vol.22.p.128 C

pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha of the Mahāvagga is to be taken. Nevertheless, we believe that here too, the Theriya tradition has conceded certain changes in the process of evolution. The accomodation of such changes perhaps became more possible with the Theriya group whose Vinaya traditions did not get petrified through disuse but continued to be live and dynamic. Yet one cannot fail to observe that these changes robbed the Pātimokkha ritual of its vigour and vitality. For there seems to be no more need for confession of guilt in the assembly of the Saṅgha. It is assured that the participants are pure in character. The Saṅgha does not collectively engage itself to punish and deal with offenders, exercising over its membership the authority of the Dhamma. The ritual as described in the Mahāvagga does not seem to provide for this. The instructions given in the Pātimokkha with regard to penalties and punishments are left with a merely theoretical value at the recital.¹ The erring individuals do not need any more to face the judiciary at the Pātimokkha recital. For the confession of guilt can now be made before a single individual.² Even if one remembers during the recital of the Pātimokkha an offence he had committed he needs confess it only to a single

¹ See Vin.III.109, 186

² Vin.I.125f.

Bhikkhu who sits beside him and promise to make amends for it after the conclusion of the ritual.¹ On the other hand, the ritual is prefaced with a number of formalities by way of preliminary duties, *pubbakicca* and *pubbakaraṇa*, which assume considerable ritualistic importance.² They completely outweigh the recital and the consequent confession which formed the core of the ritual. The Pātimokkha recital thereafter ceases to be a powerful instrument in the proper maintenance of monastic discipline. While we witness here, on the one hand, the break down of the centralised administration of this monastic institution, the ritual of the Pātimokkha, we discover on the other the emergence of a completely decentralised system of the same. It has been made possible for a minimum of four Bhikkhus, without any reference to the membership of a Sīmā, to undertake collectively the recital of the Pātimokkha: *Anujānāmi bhikkhave catunnaṃ pātimokkhaṃ uddisitun'ti*. Vin.I.124. This gives the Pātimokkha recital a very provincial character and robs it of its stature and dignity. But it would be clear from what has been said so far that the crystallized tradition of the Suttas contemplates a different position. But it also seems to be clear that the tradition of the Suttas regarding

¹ Ibid.126

² Kkv.11f.

the Pātimokkha recital, like many other Sutta traditions pertaining to problems of Vinaya, soon became a thing of the past.

It is probably at such a stage in the history of the Pātimokkha ritual that it became possible to say that the Pātimokkha or the Uposatha is intended for the purpose of bringing about monastic unity while the purity of the Saṅgha is the burden of the Pavāraṇā (*Uposatho samaggattho visuddhatthā pavāraṇā*. Vinvi.p.190. v.2599). Hence we would choose to conclude with a few observations on the Pavāraṇā.

The Pavāraṇā is the ritual which comes usually at the end of the third month of the rains-retreat and is a part of the observance of the Vassāvāsa. It is used like the ritual of the Pātimokkha as a means of safeguarding monastic discipline. The Pavāraṇā, as the name itself suggests, is the request which a Bhikkhu makes to the Saṅgha with whom he has spent the rains-retreat to judge his conduct and declare according to what the Saṅgha has seen, heard or suspected whether he is guilty of any transgressions. This request for the public scrutiny of one's conduct is made by every member of the Saṅgha, irrespective of seniority, on the definite understanding that whosoever stands accused would make amends for his errors when he recognises them as such (*Saṅghaṃ āvuso pavāremi*

diṭṭhena vā sutena vā parisāṅkhāya vā. Vadantu maṃ āyasmanto anumampaṃ upādāya. Passanto paṭikarissāmi. Vin.I.159). The benefits resulting from this form of self-correction are given as:

a) being agreeable to and tolerant of one another:

aññamaññānulomatā

b) making amends for the wrongs done by safeguarding against their recurrence: *āpattivuṭṭhānatā.*

c) developing a regard and respect for the rules of discipline:

*vinayapurekkhāratā.*¹

It is evident that the disciplinary function of the Pavāraṇā is very similar to that of the Pātimokkha ritual and hence the details of procedure in both rituals are for the most part identical. A monk who is prevented from participating in the Pavāraṇā on account of illness is expected, as in the case of the Pātimokkha ritual, to communicate to the Saṅgha through another his request for the judgement of his conduct (*Pavāraṇaṃ dammi pavāraṇaṃ me hara mamatthāya pavārehīti.* Vin.I.161).² Although total and complete participation would have been the ideal aimed at in these two rituals, yet

¹ Vin.I.159

² Cf. Vin.I.120

under circumstances very similar to those connected with the recital of the Pātimokkha, the quorum for the performance of this ceremony in the assembly of the Saṅgha (*saṅghe pavāretum*) is fixed at five.¹ Any number of monks below this and down to two persons are expected to perform this ritual among themselves (*aññamaññaṃ pavāretum*). A solitary monk who is left to himself must make a personal resolve (*adhiṭṭhāna*) on this matter, similar to the Adhiṭṭhāna Uposatha of the Pātimokkha ritual. The position of monks who are guilty of offences which exclude them from participation in the ritual of the Pavāraṇā is identical with similar situations in the ritual of the Pātimokkha.²

However, a very distinct feature of the ritual of the Pavāraṇā is its dynamic character, specially in contrast to the Pātimokkha which already in the Mahāvagga has lost its vitality and appears to have only a ceremonial significance. When, for instance, a monk is charged at the Pavāraṇā with a Pārājika offence, if he were to admit that he is guilty of it, then disciplinary action is promptly taken against him (*So ce bhikkhave cudito bhikkhu pārājikaṃ ajjhāpanno'ti paṭijānāti nāsetvā saṅghena pavāretabbaṃ*. Vin.I.173), unlike at the ritual of the Pātimokkha

¹ Ibid.163

² Ibid.164. Cf. Ibid.125f. See also Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p.375.n.1.

where suspension of the Pātimokkha, without any reference to the admission or denial of guilt by the accused, is the only course of action recommended.¹ Likewise, in the case of a Saṅghādisesa offence, the charge is laid on the offender on his admission of guilt. For all other offences too, necessary disciplinary action is taken according to the prescriptions of the law and the Saṅgha thereafter proceeds with the ritual of the Pavāraṇā: *yathā-dhammaṃ kārāpetvā saṅghena pavāretabbaṃ*. Vin.I.173. There is evidence to show that the ritual is, in fact, temporarily suspended in certain cases until necessary action is taken against the offender and he makes amends for his mistake (*Ye te bhikkhave bhikkhu thullaccayaditṭhino tehi so bhikkhave bhikkhu ekamantaṃ apānetvā yathādhammaṃ kārāpetvā saṅghaṃ upasaṅkamtivā evaṃ assa vacanīyo yaṃ kho so āvuso bhikkhu āpattiṃ āpanno sā 'ssa yathādhammaṃ paṭikatā. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho pavāreyyā'ti*. Vin.I.173).

Leaving all details aside, when we compare the two institutions of Pātimokkha and Pavāraṇā, we note one important distinction. In the early Pātimokkha recital it was the individual Bhikkhu who judged his guilt or innocence in terms of the regulations of the Pātimokkha. The assembly of the Saṅgha

¹ Ibid.II.244

had to rely on the *bona fide* of the individuals. The accusation, if any at all, was pronounced in consequence of the confession of the erring member. At the Pavāraṇā, the request made individually by the members of the assembly transfers this initiative to the collective body of the Saṅgha. This arrangement to face the scrutiny by the Saṅgha which is implied here, although occurring only as an annual event, shows itself as an additional safeguard in the maintenance of good monastic discipline.

Nevertheless, the Pavāraṇā too, shows signs of acquiring a more and more ritualistic character. As in the case of the Pātimokkha, an idea seems to be gaining ground that the Pavāraṇā is to be performed only by the monks who are pure. The Buddha, it is said, meant it to be so: *bhagavatā kho āvuso visuddhānaṃ pavāraṇā paññattā*. Vin.I.174. It is also said that the Buddha legislated for the exclusion of guilty monks from the Pavāraṇā.¹ This gives the Pavāraṇā the appearance of a solemn conclave for it is said that the Pavāraṇā is laid down only for the Saṅgha who are united: *bhagavatā kho āvuso samaggānaṃ pavāraṇā paññattā*. Vin.I.174. The same idea of ritualistic purity which came to be associated with the recital of the Pātimokkha seems also to be at work in the Pavāraṇā. The

¹ Ibid.I.164

request made to the Saṅgha at the Pavāraṇā to sit in judgement over one's conduct (*saṅghaṃ āvuso pavāremi ...* Vin.I.159) would thus be made a formal and meaningless one. We would refer the reader to Vin.I.175. for various other details concerning the ritual of the Pavāraṇā.

What becomes clear from all these is the fact that both these rituals of Pātimokkha and Pavāraṇā had, at the time of their origin, a similarity of purpose. They both strove for the maintenance of good monastic discipline and communal harmony. As such, they counted on the loyal co-operation and the sincerity and the integrity of the members of the Saṅgha. Partisan rivalries and petty considerations were not provided for. But the history of these two institutions as recorded in the Vinaya Piṭaka shows that, contrary to expectations, these disruptive forces contributed considerably to the modification of the character of these institutions. The Pātimokkha and the Pavāraṇā, we are compelled to regard as being extremely simple in their origin and they also appear to have been characteristically direct in operation. We have shown in this essay, as far as possible, how changes set in ere long, prompted by diverse circumstances, and how the Pātimokkha and the Pavāraṇā acquired in course of time a very formal and rigidly ritualistic character so divorced from their original spirit. The fossilised remains of the older versions which are

Chapter IX - The Ritual of the Pātimokkha

embedded in places in the present form of these rituals reveal, even though unwittingly, these marked divergences.

CHAPTER X Penalties and Punishments

In Buddhist monasticism disciplinary action against offenders proceeds primarily from the authority of the Pātimokkha which was promulgated to regulate the life of the monk. However, four different types of situations which necessitate disciplinary action or legal proceedings (referred to as *adhikaraṇa*) are recognised both in the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas (*Cattār'imāni ānanda adhikaraṇāni. Katamāni cattāri. Vivādādhikaraṇaṃ anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ āpattādhikaraṇaṃ kiccādhikaraṇaṃ. Imāni kho ānanda cattāri adhikaraṇāni. M.II.247. Also: Adhikaraṇaṃ nāma cattāri adhikaraṇāni vivādādhikaraṇaṃ anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ āpattādhikaraṇaṃ kiccādhikaraṇaṃ. Vin.III.164. See further Vin.II.88; IV.126). They are Vivādādhikaraṇa, Anuvādādhikaraṇa, Āpattādhikaraṇa and Kiccādhikaraṇa. Of these, the Āpattādhikaraṇa includes offences which come under the transgressions listed in the Pātimokkha. The Khandhakas speak of this as consisting of the fivefold and the sevenfold groups of Āpatti or offences which are essentially the burden of the Pātimokkha (*Tattha katamaṃ āpattādhikaraṇaṃ. Pañca'pi āpattikkhandhā āpattādhikaraṇaṃ satta'pi āpattikkhandhā āpattādhikaraṇaṃ. Idam vuccati**

āpattādhikaraṇaṃ. Vin.II.88). This, more than the others, has relevance to the personal, moral well-being of the disciple. The rest are *Vivādādhikaraṇa* or disputes arising within the community pertaining to matters of the Dhamma or the Vinaya, *Anuvādādhikaraṇa* or accusation of fellow-members and *Kiccādhikaraṇa* or disturbances resulting from the failure to observe proper procedure in all monastic acts. These latter three *adhikaraṇa* appear to show greater concern for the solidarity of the monastic community and the concord among its members.

It has already been observed that the Vinaya Piṭaka takes cognizance of both these aspects of discipline, of the individual as well as of the group, and provides for the correction of offences and omissions which violate its injunctions. Nevertheless, its claim to discipline the Buddhist disciple is only in terms of word and deed. Thus it emphasises the point that in the achievement of monastic discipline the Vinaya with its additional power of prosecution does not replace the contents of the Dhamma but only helps to augment it. For, it is the Dhamma which takes into its domain the discipline of the mind. Buddhaghosa records for us a definition of the Vinaya which corroborates this (*Kāyikavācasika-ajjhācāranisedhanato c'esa kāyaṃ vācañ ca vineti tasmā vividhanayattā visesanayattā kāyavācānañ ca vinayanato vinayo'ti akkhāto*. VinA.I.19).

Thus all disciplinary action contemplated in the Vinaya would naturally be expected to proceed against transgressions through word and deed. The only notable exception to this assumption seems to be the Ukkhepaniya-kamma or the Act of Suspension, which besides being intended for the offences of not admitting and not atoning for one's transgressions, is also recommended for holding fast to a heresy.(...*pāpikāya dīṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge*. Vin.II.26). This latter consideration, however, is to be placed under the category of verbal offences, for it comes to be declared an offence under Pācittiya 68 only after the wrong view is stated and affirmed and the offender refuses to desist from doing so.¹ Even at this stage, when the wrong view is challenged by the rest of the community, if the offender is willing to give it up, he is absolved of the guilt. It is his unwillingness to give up his view and desist from saying so which brings upon him the specific accusation under Pācittiya 68.² Under the imposition of Ukkhepaniya-kamma too, the miscreant is first asked to refrain from giving expression to false views and thereby make groundless charges against the Buddha (*Mā'vuso ariṭṭha evaṃ avaca mā bhagavantam abbhācikkhi na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhakkhānaṃ na hi*

¹ Vin.IV.135

² Ibid.

bhagavā evaṃ vadeyya. Vin.II.25. Also Vin.IV.134). If the offender continues to do so inspite of these requests then he is punished with an Ukkhepaniya-kamma. For when members of the monastic community hold fast to such views and give public expression to them it would be damaging to the beliefs of the rest. It would also discredit the community in the eyes of the public. Buddhaghosa appears to see in this Act of Suspension a relevance to the maintenance of monastic concord. The term *diṭṭhi* which occurs in the clause *pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge* under the Ukkhepaniya-kamma is defined by Buddhaghosa as views which would lead to factions and disturbances in the Saṅgha (*Bhaṇḍana-kāraḥoti ādisu yaṃ diṭṭhiṃ nissāya bhaṇḍanādīni karoti tassā appaṭinissagge y'eva kammaṃ kātabbaṃ*. VinA.VI.1159).

Although this offence of holding fast to a heresy is included in the Pātimokkha under the lighter category of Pācittiya offences, yet it is clear from the evidence of the Pātimokkha itself that it was treated with greater concern than the rest.¹ The Pātimokkha makes no mention of the Ukkhepaniya-kamma in this connexion. However, it is clear from Pācittiya 69 which follows the incident of holding fast to a heresy that the offender is subjected to the Ukkhepaniya-kamma and is punished with a

¹ See Pāc.69: Vin.IV.137

total boycott (*Yo pana bhikkhu jānaṃ tathāvādinā bhikkhunā akatānudhammena taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhena saddhiṃ sambhuñjeyya vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeyya pācittiyaṃ*. Vin.IV.137). In effect, this is what comes out of the Ukkhepaniya-kamma. The Old Commentary in the Suttavibhaṅga, on the other hand, uses the word *ukkhitto* with reference to the offender who has been so punished (*Akatānudhammo nāma ukkhitto anosārito*. Ibid.). This is further corroborated by the Ukkhittānuvattaka Pārājika rule of the Bhikkhunis which refers to the offending Bhikkhu who is not to be followed by the Bhikkhunis as *ukkhitta* which means that he has been punished under the Ukkhepaniya-kamma.¹ All these make it quite clear that as a form of punishment the Ukkhepaniya seems to have been in vogue fairly early in the history of the Sāsana.² Buddhaghosa readily identifies what is

¹ Vin.IV.218

² Note Oldenberg's remarks: 'It deserves to be noticed that in the same way as the Pabbājaniya kamma is not mentioned in the Pātimokkha, neither is there any mention of the similar proceedings of the Ukkhepaniyakamma, etc., however much occasion for it might appear.' Vin. I. p.xix. But this does not mean that these two forms of punishment, banishment (Pabbājaniya) and Suspension (Ukkhepaniya) were not known to the Pātimokkha. Saṅgh.13 uses the term *pabbājenti* with obvious familiarity. Note:..... *tādīsikāya āpattiyā*

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

alluded to in the Pātimokkha under Pācittiya 69 with the punishment of Ukkhepaniya kamma (*Akatānudhammenā'ti anudhammo'ti vuccati āpattiyā adassane vā appaṭikamme vā pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissage vā dhammena vinayena ukkhittassa anulomavattaṃ disvā katosaraṇā so osaraṇasaṅkhāto anudhammo yassa na kato ayaṃ akatānudhammo nāma*. Kkvt.127).

The code of the Pātimokkha itself, in its details of disciplinary procedure, recommends certain forms of penalties for the categories of major offences. The Pārājika, being the gravest of the monastic offences, admits of no remedies or atonements.

ekaccaṃ pabbājenti ekaccaṃ na pabbājenti. Vin.III.184. Likewise, Pārājika 7 of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha (Pārājika 3 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga) knows not only of Bhikkhus who have been suspended (*ukkhittaṃ bhikkhuṃ*) but knows also the fact that such disciplinary action has been taken by the collectively responsible body of the Saṅgha (*samaggena saṅghena ukkhittaṃ bhikkhuṃ*. Vin.IV.218). It should also be pointed out here that in the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha where disciplinary action in terms of Banishment and Suspension appears to be evident it is still left informally in the hands of the Bhikkhus. The responsibility does not seem to be vested in the Saṅgha (*So bhikkhu bhikkhūhi evamassa vacanīyo ... pakkamat'āyasmā imamahā āvāsā. Alan te idha vāsenā'ti*. Vin.III.184. Also Vin.IV.135).

The penalty for Pārājika offences being complete ex-communication and loss of monastic status, it is spontaneously brought about by the commission of the crime. Thus, the disciplinary action on the Pārājika offences requires no details of procedure. The Saṅgha has only to take note of the fact that the offender is no more one of their fold and that they have no dealings with him: *na labhati bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ yathā pure tathā pacchā pārājiko hoti asaṃvāso* - Vin.III.109. The Vinaya appears to refer to this briefly as the process of destruction or extermination (*So ce bhikkhave cudito bhikkhu pārājikaṃ ajjhāpanno'ti paṭijānāti nāsetvā saṅghena pavāretabbaṃ*. Vin.I.173).

All offences other than the Pārājika are remediable in that every offender, barring one who is guilty of a Pārājika offence, who submits himself to the specified penalties and punishments and behaves himself in accordance with the law is considered as being purged of his guilt. The Saṅghādisesas include a host of offences for which specified penalties are to be imposed by the Saṅgha, taking into consideration the circumstances attendant on the commission of the crime.¹ The Cullavagga draws a definite distinction between Saṅghādisesa offences which are confessed forthwith on the day of commission and

¹ Vin.III.118

those which have been concealed from the Saṅgha for any length of time. They are termed *apaṭicchanna* and *paṭicchanna* respectively.¹ Buddhaghosa reckons this period of concealment as extending, theoretically, to over sixty years (*Tato paraṃ atirekaśaṃvaccharam dviśaṃvaccharam evaṃ yāva satṭhisamvaccharam atirekasatṭhisamvaccharapaṭicchannan'ti.* Kkvt.49). However, the code of the Pātimokkha makes no special mention of the former group of *apaṭicchanna* or offences which are confessed soon after commission.

The Cullavagga which discusses the details of disciplinary procedure in relation to Saṅghādisesa offences recommends different disciplinary measures for the two categories mentioned above.² The penalty that is prescribed for a Saṅghādisesa offence which has not been concealed is a very direct one. The Saṅgha is called upon to impose on the offender, at his request, the penalty of Mānatta for a period of six days (*Vyattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena saṅgho ñāpetabbo. Suṇātu me bhante saṅgho. Ayaṃ udāyi bhikkhu ekaṃ āpattiṃ āpajji sañcetanikaṃ sukkavissatṭhiṃ apaṭicchannaṃ. So saṅghaṃ ekissā āpattiyā sañcetanikāya sukkavissatṭhiyā apaṭicchannāya chārattaṃ mānattaṃ yācati. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho udāyissa*

¹ Vin.II.38f.

² Ibid.38ff.

bhikkhuno ekissā āpattiyā sañcetanikāya sukkavissaṭṭhiyā apaṭicchannāya chāratam mānattam dadeyya. Esā ñatti. Vin.II.38). Commenting on these injunctions Buddhaghosa states that irrespective of the considerations of confession or concealment, the miscreant incurs this penalty of Mānatta by the mere commission of the offence (*Tattha apaṭicchanna-mānattam nāma yaṃ apaṭicchannāya āpattiyā parivāsam adatvā kevalam āpattiṃ āpannabhāven'eva mānattārahassa mānattam diyyati.* VinA.VI.1171). This penalty of Mānatta is also recommended as the concluding phase of the disciplinary action taken against Saṅghādisesa offences which have been concealed and for which the penalty known as Parivāsa is first imposed on the offender (*Parivutthaparivāsenā bhikkhunā uttarim chāratam bhikkhumānattāya paṭipajjitabbaṃ.* Vin.III.186. Also: *So' haṃ parivutthaparivāso saṅgham ekissā āpattiyā sañcetanikāya sukkavissaṭṭhiyā ekāhapaṭicchannāya chāratam mānattam yācāmi* Vin.II.41).

In the case of a Saṅghādisesa offence which has been deliberately concealed, disciplinary action commences with the penalty of Parivāsa which is imposed for the same number of days up to which the offence had been concealed. The concealment of an offence committed by oneself was a disconcerting breach of monastic decorum and it was seen in the study of the Pātimokkha how every precaution was taken to

safeguard against such situations (*Saramāno santiṃ āpattiṃ n'āvikareyya sampajānamusāvād'assa hoti. Vin.I.103*).¹ Pācittiya 64 declares it an offence even to aid and abet in such a situation (*Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhussa jānaṃ duṭṭhullaṃ āpattiṃ paṭicchādeyya pācittiyaṃ. Vin.IV.127*). No monk shall knowingly shield an offender who is guilty of a *duṭṭhullā āpatti*, i.e. a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa offence. The concern with which attempts to conceal such offences are treated is witnessed in this penalty of Parivāsa. According to the Cullavagga, a monk who is guilty of concealing a Saṅghādisesa offence which he has committed, must go before the Saṅgha and confess to them his error. He must then request the Saṅgha to impose on him first the Parivāsa penalty for the number of days the offence had been concealed. It is only after the offender has behaved himself perfectly well under the penalty of Parivāsa for concealing his offence, that Mānatta, the penalty for the actual Saṅghādisesa offence, would be imposed.²

The injunctions of the Pātimokkha regarding this penalty of Parivāsa make it clear that as a manual of disciplinary procedure the Pātimokkha maintained an authoritative

¹ *Supra* p.100

² Vin.II.40

enforcement of penalties and punishments, even though on an impersonal note. This is clearly recognised in the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta where it is stated that punishment is meted out not on the authority of persons but solely on the authority of the Dhamma (*Tasmīñ ce bhaññamāne hoti bhikkhussa āpatti hoti vītikkamo taṃ mayaṃ yathādhammaṃ yathāsatthaṃ kāremā'ti. Na kira no bhavanto kārenti dhammo no kāretī'ti.* M.III.10). The monk who has concealed the Saṅghādisesa offence he has committed must, according to the Pātimokkha, submit himself to the penalty of Parivāsa. even if it were not to his liking (*Uddiṭṭhā kho āyasmanto terasa saṅghādisesā dhammā nava paṭhamāpattikā cattāro yāvatiyakā yesaṃ bhikkhu aññataraṃ vā aññataraṃ vā āpajjitvā yāvatihaṃ jānaṃ paṭicchādeti tāvatihaṃ tena bhikkhunā akāmā parivatthabbaṃ.* Vin.III.186). The injunctions of the Pātimokkha introduce this penalty with a note of compulsion. This attitude is also held by schools besides the Theriya. The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mūlasarvāstivādins records the same idea (*Uddiṣṭā mayāyuṣmantastrayodasa saṅghāvaśeṣā dharmāh... tena akāmatah paryuṣitavyaṃ -* IHQ.vol.29.2.p.174). The Prātimokṣasūtra of the

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

Mahāsaṅghikas puts it in the following form: ...*tena bhikṣunā akāmaparivāsaṃ parivasitavyaṃ*.¹

The Vinaya Piṭaka knows of two forms of Parivāsa, one as a period of punishment and the other as a period of probation. As a form of punishment it pertains, as was shown above, to the members of the Buddhist Order and is recommended as a penalty for a Bhikkhu who is guilty of a Saṅghādisesa offence and had knowingly concealed it from the Saṅgha. Thus it is known by the name of Paṭicchannaparivāsa, the term Apaṭicchannaparivāsa consequently being used for the period of probation applicable to members of other heretic groups. Hence it is also called Titthiyaparivāsa. The Paṭicchannaparivāsa is to be imposed even against the will of the offender for the number of days the offence had been concealed. This is followed by the further penalty of Mānatta for six more days. Both these penalties being satisfactorily concluded the monk who has been subjected to them is reinstated by the Act of Abbhāna by the properly constituted body of twenty monks. If the number were to be less even by one, then this reinstatement would be rendered invalid (*ciṇṇamānatto bhikkhu yattha siyā vīsatiḅaṇo bhikkhusaṅgho tattha so bhikkhu abbhetaḅbo. Ekena' pi ce ūṇo vīsatiḅaṇo*

¹ *Gaṅgānāth Jhā Research Institute Journal/Vol.X. Appendix p.13*

bhikkhusarīgho taṃ bhikkhuṃ abbheyya so ca bhikkhu anabbhato te ca bhikkhū gārayhā. Vin.III.186).

The Khandhakas make further provision for new situations where a monk may lapse into error again during the period of his sentence. If, at the time of his second offence which he confesses forthwith, he is still serving his period of Parivāsa for the first offence which he had concealed, or has just finished the period of Parivāsa but not started on his Mānatta, then he is called upon to serve his period of Parivāsa over again. But if the second offence is committed during the period of Mānatta or when he is about to be reinstated on the completion of it, then he shall serve only the full period of Mānatta again. If on the other hand, the second offence is concealed for any length of time, irrespective of the time of its commission, whether during the period of Parivāsa or Mānatta, the penalty of Parivāsa is to be gone through over again for which ever is the longer period of concealment. This is called the combined penalty or Samodhānaparivāsa, as the periods of punishment for the different offences are to run concurrently and not successively.¹ This renewal of punishment to serve a sentence again either under Mānatta or under Parivāsa is known as Mūlāya-ṭṭikassana or 'being dragged back to the beginning'. The

¹ Vin.II.48ff.

Khandhakas deal with several such situations of diverse complexity. But it is not within the scope of the present study to go into a detailed analysis of these. Hence the reader is referred to the Cullavagga for fuller details.¹

Both these penalties of Parivāsa and Mānatta are characterised by the humiliation to which they subject the offender. Under the proper behaviour recommended (*sammā vattanā*) for those serving a period of Parivāsa or Mānatta (*parivāsika* and *mānattacārika*)², it is repeatedly mentioned that he who is guilty and is placed under a penalty should make it known to the rest of the Bhikkhus. The *parivāsika* and the *mānattacārika* should as both guest and host inform the other Bhikkhus of their position (*Parivāsikena bhikkhunā āgantukena ārocetabbaṃ āgantukassa ārocetabbaṃ*. Vin.II.32). They should also announce it at the regular assemblies of Uposatha and Pavāraṇā. Even in case of illness when personal attendance may not be possible, they should communicate it through a messenger, who according to the Commentary should be a full-fledged monk and not an *anupasampanna*.³ The *mānattacārika* has the additional burden of announcing the

¹ Ibid.43ff.

² Ibid.32.

³ VinA.VI.1166 on Vin.II.32

fact of his being under a penalty each day.¹ The Khandhakas also decree against all attempts of a *parivāsika* or *mānattacārika* to evade informing the fellow members that he is under a penalty. It is said, for instance, that during this period he should not take to the vow of forest-residence in order to avoid meeting others who come to his residence,² or take to the vow of begging for his meals so that he may avoid occupying the last of the seats which he would have to accept in the alms-hall as a part of the penalty.³ (*Na araññikaṅgaṃ'ti āgatāgatānaṃ ārocetuṃ harāyamānena araññikadhutaṅgaṃ na samādātabbaṃ ... tathā bhattaggādisu āsanapariyante nisajjāya harāyamānena piṇḍapātikadhutaṅgaṃ'pi na samādātabbaṃ*. VinA.VI.164). In brief, no person who is under these penalties of Parivāsa or Mānatta should make a secret of it to fellow-members (*Mā maṃ jāniṃsū'ti mā maṃ ekabhikkhu pi jānātū'ti iminā ajjhāsayena vihāre sāmaṇerehi pacāpetvā bhuñjituṃ'pi na labhati gāmaṃ piṇḍāya pavisitabbaṃ eva*. VinA.VI.1165).

All these considerations discussed above are listed under the ninetyfour observances which are laid down as the pattern

¹ Vin.II.35

² Ibid.32.

³ Ibid.

of conduct (*catunavuti-parivāsikavatta*)¹ for the Bhikkhu under the penalty of Parivāsa and are more or less identical with those for the *mānattacārika*. As in most other forms of disciplinary action in Buddhist monasticism, here too, under these penalties, a number of privileges which a monk is normally entitled to enjoy are withdrawn from him. His authority is reduced and his freedom of action is curtailed. We reproduce below the first 18 items of *catunavuti-parivāsikavatta* which are common to both the penalties of Parivāsa and Mānatta as well as to all acts of punishment or *daṇḍakamma*, viz. Tajjaniya, Nissaya, Pabbājaniya, Paṭisāraṇiya and Ukkhepaniya for not giving up a heresy.² The Ukkhepaniya kamma for the refusal to recognise one's transgressions, and the failure to make amends for them has 25 more conditions added to these, thus bringing up the total to 43 (*tecattārīsavatta*: Vin.II.25).

Not act as the preceptor of another for the conferment of *upasampadā*: *na upasampādetabbaṃ*.

Not undertake to offer tutelage to another: *na nissayo dātabbo*.

¹ Ibid.32-33.

² Ibid.pp.5, 8, 14, 19 and 27 respectively.

Not take in a *sāmaṇera* anew or accept the services of another who has been with him: *na sāmaero upaṭṭhāpetabbo*.

Not allow himself to be elected to give counsel to the Bhikkhunis: *na bhikkhuni ovādasammuti sādītabbā*.

Not avail himself of that opportunity even if it has been assigned to him: *sammateṇa'pi bhikkhuniyo na ovadītabbā*.

Not be guilty of an offence of the type for which he has been put under the particular penalty: *yāya āpattiyā saṅghena parivāso dinno hoti sā āpatti na āpajjītabbā*.

Not be guilty of another offence similar to it: *aññā vā tādīsikā*.

Not be guilty of anything worse: *tato vā pāpiṭṭhatarā*.

Not despise or challenge the validity of the disciplinary action taken against him: *kammaṃ na garahitabbam*.

Not despise those who did it: *kammikā na garahitabbā*.

Not suspend the Uposatha of another monk who is better than himself: *na pakatattassa bhikkhuno uposatho thapetabbo.*

Not suspend the Pavāraṇā of such a monk: *na pavāraṇā thapetabbā.*

Not assume authority to issue orders on disciplinary matters to such a monk: *na savacanīyaṃ kātappaṃ.* This explanation of *savacanīyaṃ kātappaṃ* is derived from the Commentary (VinA.VI.1163) to which the Sub-commentary adds this further note: *evaṃ attano āṇāya pavattanakammaṃ na kātappan'ti adhippāyo.* Vimativinodanītikā.449.

Not assume leadership at monastic functions: *na anuvādo paṭṭhapetabbo.* For this explanation too, we lean on the Commentary: *na anuvādo'ti vihārajetthakaṭṭhānaṃ na kātappaṃ pātimokkhuddesakena vā dhammajjhesakena vā na bhavitappaṃ.* VinA.VI.1163

Not ask another monk who is better than himself for an opportunity to accuse him of an offence: *na okāso kāretabbo.*

Not accuse another monk who is better than himself of an offence: *na codetabbo*.

Not remind another monk who is better than himself of his offence: *na sāretabbo*.

Not quarrel with members of the community nor incite them against one another: *na bhikkhūhi sampayojetabbaṃ*. See Commentary: VinA.VI.1156, 1163

These conditions may broadly be classified as follows: 1-5 involve a considerable reduction in the power and prestige enjoyed by the monks in their normal daily life. A monk must, during the term of the penalty, renounce his authority over his pupils and decline the services offered to him by them. He is not only deprived of his power and position but according to the Commentary is also made to inform his pupils and the nuns who come to him about the penalty to which he is subjected (*Upajjhaṃ datvā gahitasāmaṇera'pi vattabbā ahaṃ vinayakammaṃ karomi. Mayhaṃ vattaṃ mā karotha mā maṃ gāmapavesanaṃ āpucchathā'ti ... āgatā ca bhikkhuniyo saṅghassa santikaṃ gacchatha saṅgho vo ovādadāyakaṃ jānissatī'ti vā ahaṃ vinayakammaṃ karomi asukabhikkhussa nāma santikaṃ gacchatha so ovādaṃ dassatī ti vā vattabbā*. VinA.VI.1162). 6-8 reiterate the old ideal in monastic discipline

of *āyati saṃvara* or the safeguard against the recurrence of an offence which has once been committed. 9 and 10 provide that the machinery which regulates the discipline of monastic life would not be thrown out of gear by the miscreants who have been brought under punishment. The power of prosecution must thus be maintained unimpaired. 11-17 concern themselves with the proper and responsible exercise of disciplinary powers by those whose conduct is beyond reproach, so that it may command from those who are subordinated to it the highest respect as being fair and just. Thus a monk who is subjected to a penalty or punishment is barred from exercising such powers. 18 serves as a perfect safeguard against possible onslaughts on the communal harmony of the Saṅgha by embittered offenders who are subjected to penalties and punishments.¹

We have shown above that the penalty of Paṭicchannaparivāsa which is imposed on a monk who is guilty of concealing a Saṅghādisesa offence is followed by a further

¹ In interpreting the condition *bhikkhūhi na sampayojetabbam* in the manner given above we choose to agree with Miss Horner who translates it as 'He should not quarrel with monks'. This translation is, in fact, supported by the Commentary. Oldenberg renders it as 'ought not to associate with the bhikkhus'. *Vinaya Texts* II. [SBE.XVII] p.339

penalty of six days of Mānatta (*Parivutthaparivāseṇa bhikkhunā uttarim chārattaṃ bhikkhumānattāya paṭipajjitabbaṃ*. Vin.III.186). This, according to the commentarial tradition, is intended for the purpose of reconciliation of the miscreant with the fellow-members (*Bhikkhumānattāyā'ti bhikkhūnaṃ mānanabhāvāya ārāghanatthāya iti vuttaṃ hoti*. Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī.51). This clearly shows that the offender loses favour with the members of the community by his violation of monastic regulations. It also shows the degree of collective responsibility for the maintenance of discipline. The community as a whole would be slighted by such a breach of discipline. This point is further emphasised in the text of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣasūtra which has *saṅghamānatva* corresponding to *bhikkhumānatta* of the Pali text, thus addressing the amends and atonements which the miscreant is called upon to make to the collective organisation.¹ The Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣasūtra has also these additional words in this context which are not found in the Pali text:² *Kṛtānudharmah bhikṣusaṅghasya ārādhitacitto*. These seem to be supporting the Pali commentarial explanation of Mānatta as

¹ IHQ.Vol.29. No.2. p.174

² Vin.III.186

*bhikkhūnaṃ mānanabhāvāya ārādhanatthāya.*¹ The Mahāsaṅghika Prātimokṣasūtra has only *kṛtānudharmah* and leaves out the words *Bhikṣusaṅghasya ārādhitacitto* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda version. But it speaks of *mānatva* as *bhikṣusaṅghe mānatvaṃ caritavyaṃ.*²

Parivāsa as a period of probation pertains to persons who, having been previously members of any other heretic group, latterly seek admision to the Buddhist order. Every such person is put under probation for a specified period of four months during which he must conduct himself honourably to the satisfaction of the Bhikkhus in authority (*Yo kho seniya aññatitthiyapubbo imasmiṃ dhamminaye ākaṅkhati pabbajjaṃ ākaṅkhati upasampadaṃ so cattāro māse parivasati catunnaṃ māsānaṃ accayena āraddhacittā bhikkhū pabbājenti upasampādentī bhikkhubhāvāya.* M.I.391). In the text of the Khandhakas, the Aggika Jaṭilas or fire-worshipping matted-hair ascetics are exempted from this on consideration of their religious views (*Ye te bhikkhave aggikā jaṭilakā te āgatā upasampādetabbā na tesam parivāso dātabbo. Taṃ kissa hetu. Kammavādino ete bhikkhave kiriyavādino.* Vin.I.71). It is

¹ Kkv.51.

² *Journal of the Gangānāth Jhā Research Institute*, Vol. X. Appendix p.13.

recorded that the Sākiyas also are exempted. The Buddha, according to the Commentary, held the view that the Sākiyas, out of respect for the founder as their greatest kinsman, would do nothing to discredit the religion. (*Te hi titthāyatane pabbajitā'pi sāsanaṃ avaṇṇakāmā na honti. Aṃhākaṃ ṇātisetthassa sāsanaṃ'ti vaṇṇavādino'va honti. Tasmā evaṃ āha.* VinA.V.995). The commentary also insists that this Titthiya-parivāsa applies only to the naked ascetics (*Ayaṃ titthiyaparivāso nāma apaṭicchannaparivāso'ti'pi vuccati. Ayaṃ pana naggaparibbājakass'eva ājivakassa vā acelakassa vā dātabbo ...Tattha titthiyaparivāso nigaṇṭhajātikānaṃ y'eva dātabbo na aññesaṃ.* Ibid.990f.).¹

According to the Khandhakas the newcomer is made to don the yellow robe after his head and beard have been shaven and is admitted to the order as a *sāmaṇera* by the act of professing faith thrice in the Buddha, Dhamma and the Saṅgha.² Showing respect to the accepted monastic tradition, he is made to request the Saṅgha to put him under four months probation so that he may qualify for *upasampadā* or higher monastic status.³

¹ For a closer examination of these views the reader is referred to S. Dutt's *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.147f.

² Vin.I.82

³ Ibid.69

During this period the novice must satisfy the Saṅgha (*ārādhako hoti*) by his conduct, efficiency and loyalties and convince them that he deserves the higher monastic status in the Buddhist Saṅgha. For this he should qualify himself in terms of eight considerations which are referred to as *aṭṭhavatta*. He should acquire habits which are acceptable to the monastic life such as going out to and returning from the village at proper times. As a celibate he should maintain his chastity. He should adapt himself to perform with interest and efficiency the various monastic duties that devolve on him as a member of the Saṅgha. He should not be lacking in interest and enthusiasm for the development of his religious life. The next four out of the eight duties which he is called upon to perform seem to concern themselves with the clash of loyalties between the old and the new faiths. If the new comer still feels angered when his former faith or its propounder is criticised and is happy when the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha are subjected to ridicule, then he is deemed unworthy of full membership in the Buddhist Order. On the other hand, if he rejoices at the praise of his old faith and frowns at the eulogy of the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha the same verdict is pronounced on him. When the novice has thus satisfied the Saṅgha (*ārādhacittā'ti aṭṭhavattassa pūraṇena tuṭṭhacittā*. MA.III.106) and qualified himself in terms of these basic requirements for Buddhist

monastic life, *upasampadā* is conferred upon him without further delay (*Evaṃ ārādhako kho bhikkhave aññatitthiyapubbo āgato upasampādetabbo*. Vin.I.71).

The Sutta Piṭaka refers in more than one place to the prevalence of this practice of imposing Titthiyaparivāsa in Buddha's own time. The Kukkuravatika Sutta records that the Buddha himself informs Seniya who was a naked ascetic practising the 'canine way' of the general Buddhist practice of Titthiyaparivāsa when he sought admission to the Buddhist monastic life (*Yo kho seniya aññatitthiyapubbo imasmiṃ dhammavinaye ākaṅkhati pabajjaṃ ākaṅkhati upasampadaṃ so cattāro māse parivasati. Catunnaṃ māsānaṃ accayena āraddhacittā bhikkhū pabbājenti upasampādentī bhikkhubhāvāya. Api ca m'ettha puggalavemattatā veditā*. M.I.391). A similar incident occurs in the Mahāvaccagotta Sutta¹ with reference to the Paribbājaka Vacchagotta and in the Māgandiya Sutta² with reference to the Paribbājaka Māgandiya. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta³ we come across the story of Subhadda, the last disciple of the Buddha who as an *aññatitthiyapubba* was treated similarly by him. The Saṃyutta

¹ M.I.494

² Ibid.512

³ D.II.152

Nikāya gives us the story of Acela Kassapa who receives similar treatment in the hands of the Buddha.¹ However, the Buddha admits in all these cases that the persons concerned are not of the general type contemplated, and that he would hence exempt them from the general requirement. On the other hand, we find Seniya and the rest expressing their willingness to stand the trial and go under probation, not only for four months but even for four years, in order to be admitted to the Buddhist Order. Buddhaghosa, who presents them as recognising the purpose of this test, stresses thereby the fact already witnessed in the Khandhakas that this was a safeguard against the entry into the Order of men of fickle faith who change their former beliefs and seek new ones without much conviction (*Tato seniyo cintesi aho acchariyaṃ buddhasāsanam yattha evaṃ ghaṃsitvā koṭṭetvā yuttaṃ eva gaṇhanti ayuttaṃ chaḍḍenti'ti*. MA.III.106). The Vinaya Piṭaka records instances of men who on the slightest provocation revert back to their old order (*Tena kho pana samayena yo so aññatitthiyapubbo upajjhāyena sahadhammikaṃ vuccamāno upajjhāyassa vādaṃ āropetvā taṃ y'eva titthāyatanam saṃkama* - Vin.I.69).

¹ S.II.21

On a careful examination of the above two versions of the Titthiyaparivāsa as they appear in the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas, we notice a considerable difference between them. The statements in the Suttas clearly state that he who seeks admission to the Buddhist Order and higher monastic status therein (*pabbajjā* and *upasampadā*) must go under probation for four months, after which the Bhikkhus in authority who are satisfied with his conduct admit him into the Order and confer on him the higher monastic status. Thus he is made a Bhikkhu only at the end of this period of probation (*Catunnaṃ māsānaṃ accayena āradhacittā bhikkhū pabbājenti upasampādentī bhikkhubhāvāya*. M.I.391). This statement of the Sutta version is clear enough on the point that both *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* come after the period of Parivāsa. But this passage, which occurs in identical words both in the Majjhima and in the Saṃyutta Nikāyas, seems to cause the commentator no small degree of embarrassment. This is unavoidably so because the tradition preserved in the Khandhakas on the imposition of Titthiyaparivāsa is at variance with that of the Suttas which is presumably of pre- Khandhaka origin.

The details of the Khandhakas on this point place the Parivāsa on the newcomer after his admission as a *sāmaṇera*.¹

¹ Vin.I.69

Here Parivāsa is a qualifying test for the conferment of higher monastic status or *upasampadā* and not for admission to recluseship as it is in the Sutta versions (... *pabbājenti upasampādenti bhikkhubhāvāya.*). Hence Buddhaghosa, commenting on the above statements of the Suttas which place both *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* after Parivāsa, attempts to dismiss the word *pabbajjā* out of the context as having no meaning of its own (*Tattha pabbajjan'ti vacanasiliṭṭhatāvasena vuttam.* MA.III.106; SA.II.36f.). At the same time he explains the statements in the Suttas in the light of the Vinaya tradition. In his comments on the Suttas he quotes the version of the Khandhakas (*Atha bhagavā yo so khandhake titthiyaparivāso paññatto yaṃ aññatitthiyapubbo sāmaṇerabhūmiyaṃ ṭhito ... cattāro māse parivāsaṃ yācāmī'ti ādinā nayena samādiyivā parivasati taṃ sandhāya yo kho seniya aññatitthiyapubbo'ti ādiṃ āha.* Ibid.). He states categorically that the *aññatitthiyapubba* receives his ordination without serving the period of probation under Parivāsa. It is only after being ordained as a *sāmaṇera* that he undertakes to serve the period of Parivāsa in order to qualify for the conferment of *upasampadā* (*Aparivasitvā y'eva hi pabbajjaṃ labhati. Upasampadatthikena pana na atikālena gāmapavesanādīni aṭṭhavattāni purentena parivasitabbaṃ.* Ibid.). In this attempt to read into the Suttas an apparently subsequent tradition of the

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

Khandhakas, we see the commentator striving to accord with the tradition of the Vinaya which, in course of time, seems to have overstepped some of the traditions of the Suttas on these monastic matters. However, even in the Khandhakas, all details which pertain to the imposition of Parivāsa on an *aññatitthiyapubba* who wishes to join the Buddhist Order seem to follow from a statement which reads more or less the same as in the Suttas.

Sutta	Vinaya
<i>Yo kho seniya</i>	<i>Yo bhikkhave añño pi</i>
<i>aññatitthiyapubbo imasmim̃</i>	<i>aññatitthiyapubbo imasmim̃</i>
<i>dhammavinaye ākaṅkhati</i>	<i>dhammavinaye ākankhati</i>
<i>pabbajjaṃ ākaṅkhati</i>	<i>pabbajjaṃ ākankhati</i>
<i>upasampadaṃ so cattāro</i>	<i>upasampadaṃ tassa cattāro</i>
<i>māse parivasati.</i> ¹	<i>māse parivāso dātabbo.</i> ²

Nevertheless, in the matter of details, we see a divergence in these two accounts.

Sutta	Vinaya
-------	--------

¹ D.II.152; M.I.391, 494, 512; S.II.21

² Vin.I.69

*Catunnaṃ māsānaṃ
accayena āraddhacittā
bhikkhū pabbājenti
upasampādentī
bhikkhubhāvāya.¹*

*Evañ ca pana bhikkhave
dātabbo. Paṭhamaṃ
kesamassuṃ oharāpetvā
kāśāyāni vatthāni
acchādāpetvā ekaṃsaṃ
uttarāsaṅgaṃ kārāpetvā...
Ahaṃ bhante itthannāmo
aññatitthiyapubbo imasmim
dhammavinaye ākaṅkhāmi
upasampadaṃ. So'haṃ
bhante saṅghaṃ cattāro māse
parivāsaṃ yācāmi.²*

As against the fossilised traditions of the Suttas which refer to monastic practices, the Vinaya Piṭaka, specially the Khandhakas, reveal a more active and living spirit. As such, it provides within its framework for new situations and changing conditions. This tendency becomes abundantly clear when we study in the Khandhakas the history of the acts of *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā*. In the early history of the Sāsana, all new converts to the faith who wished to enter the monastic life were admitted by the Buddha himself at their request. They express

¹ D.II.152; M.I.391, 494, 512; S.II.21

² Vin.I.69

their desire in the stereotyped formula which states that they seek *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* under the Buddha (*Labheyyā'haṃ bhante bhagavato santike pabbajjaṃ labheyyaṃ upasampadan'ti*. Vin.I.12). The Buddha then merely invites them to come and live the monastic life, practising the Dhamma which is open to all, so that they may make a perfect end of all suffering (*Ehi bhikkhu cara brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhassa antakiriyaṃ'ti*. Ibid.). That invitation alone, says the text, constituted the conferment of full monastic status (*Sā'va tassa āyasmato upasampadā ahoṣi*. Ibid.). But as Buddhism spread over wider territories and the new converts who sought the monastic life increased in numbers, the authority for admission could no longer be centralised in the person of the Buddha. Considering the practical difficulties of time and distance involved, the Buddha deems it fit to transfer this authority to his disciples (*Etarahi kho bhikkhū nānā disā nānā janapadā pabbajjāpekkhe ca upasampadāpekkhe ca ānenti bhagavā ne pabbājessati upasampādeasatī'ti*. *Tattha bhikkhū c'eva kilamanti pabbajjāpekkhā ca upasampadāpekkhā ca*. *Yannūnā'haṃ bhikkhūnaṃ anujāneyyaṃ tumh'eva'dāni bhikkhave tāsu tāsu disāsu tesu tesu janapadesu pabbājetha upasampādethā'ti*. Vin.I.22). Henceforth, by a simple avowal of faith in the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha the new converts are to gain both *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave*

imehi tīhi saraṇagamanehi pabbajjaṃ upasampadan'ti. Ibid.). But the power vested in the disciples, as individuals, for the conferment of *upasampadā* in the above manner was soon withdrawn and the collective organization of the Saṅgha made the sole authority for that. This change, no doubt, must have come about with the growing importance of *upasampadā* as the hallmark of full membership in the monastic Order and the possible indiscreet conferment of it according to individual whims and fancies. *Upasampadā* is now to be conferred by a formal resolution before the Saṅgha, informing the members of the Saṅgha of the identity of the applicant and his preceptor (*Yā sā bhikkhave mayā tīhi saraṇagamanehi upasampadā anuññātā tā'haṃ ajjatagge paṭikkhipāmi. Anujānāmi bhikkhave ñatticatutthena kammaṇa upasampādetuṃ. Evañ ca pana bhikkhave upasampādetabbo. Vyattena bhikkunā paṭibalena saṅgho ñāpetabbo suṇātu me bhante saṅgho ayaṃ itthannāmo itthannāmassa āyasmato upasampadāpekkho. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho itthannāmaṃ upasampādeyya itthannāmena upajjhāyena. Esā ñatti.* Vin.1.56). The Samantapāsādikā, in explaining the circumstances which brought about this change, says that the Buddha wished to attach greater dignity to the conferment of *upasampadā* by bringing it under the authority of the collective organization of the Saṅgha (*Rādhabrāhamaṇavatthusmiṃ kinñcā'pi āyasmā*

sāriputto bhagavatā bārāṇasiyaṃ tīhi saraṇagamanehi anuññātaṃ pabbajjañ c'eva upasampadañ ca jānāti bhagavā pana taṃ lahukaṃ upasampadaṃ paṭikkhipitvā ñatticatutthakammena garukaṃ katvā upasampadaṃ anuññātukāmo. Atha'ssa thero ajjhāsayam viditvā kathā'ham bhante taṃ brāhmaṇaṃ pabbājemi upasampādemīti āha. VinA.V.983).

On the other hand, we find the earlier act of *pabbajjā* by the avowal of faith in the *tisaraṇa* which was coupled with the act of *upasampadā* reaffirmed in isolation under the new name of *sāmaṇerapabbajjā* (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave imehi tīhi saraṇagamanehi sāmaṇerapabbajjan'ti. Vin.I.82*). This apparently reflects the phase of monasticism in which young converts were being admitted into the Order as noviciates or *sāmaṇera* with no immediate thoughts of *upasampadā*. Here, the Samantapāsādikā suggests that this reaffirmation was necessary because of the possible misunderstanding regarding the performance of the act of *pabbajjā* after the act of *upasampadā* was isolated from it. Arguing that in the past *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* were closely identified, the monks would be in doubt, it is said, whether the *pabbajjā* should now be performed like the *upasampadā* by the method of

kammavācā or by the threefold avowal of faith in the original manner.¹ The details of procedure in the imposition of *Titthiyaparivāsa* as are described in the *Khandhakas* thus seem to follow from this distinction between the *sāmaneraḥabbajjā* and *upasampadā* and hence the consequent deflection of the tradition in the *Vinaya Piṭaka* which now stands in marked contrast to the fossilised version of the *Sutta Piṭaka*.

CHAPTER XI Additional Punitive Regulations

In the *Kammakkhandhaka* of the *Cullavagga*² we meet with another collection of disciplinary acts which are of a more general character in that, unlike the penalties of *Parivāsa* and *Mānatta*, they are not directly derived from the code of the *Pātimokkha*. The *Kammakkhandhaka* has five different *kamas* or acts of punishment of varying degrees of severity which are recommended for certain shortcomings and reprehensible features in the behaviour of members of the monastic community. They are:

1. *Tajjaniya kamma* : Act of Censure

¹ VinA.V.1009

² Vin.II.1-28

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

2. Nissaya kamma : Act of Subordination
3. Pabbājaniya kamma : Act of Banishment
4. Paṭisāraṇiya Kamma : Act of Reconciliation
5. Ukkhepaniya Kamma : Act of Suspension

The following enumeration of monastic failings is given in the Cullavagga as applying to the Tajjaniya, Nissaya, Pabbājaniya and Ukkhepaniya kammās.¹

- A.
 1. When a Bhikkhu is a maker of strife, quarrelsome, a maker of disputes, given to idle talk, and raises legal questions in the Saṅgha.
 2. When he is ignorant, unaccomplished, full of offences and heedless of injunctions.
 3. If he lives in company with householders, in unbecoming association with householders.
- B.
 1. If in regard to moral habit, he comes to have fallen away from moral habit.
 2. If in regard to good habits, he comes to have fallen away from good habits.
 3. If in regard to right views, he comes to have fallen away from right views.
- C.
 1. If he speaks dispraise of the Buddha.
 2. If he speaks dispraise of the Dhamma.
 3. If he speaks dispraise of the Saṅgha.

If a Bhikkhu is marked by the qualities of any one of the above groups, the Sṅgha may subject him to any one of the five

¹ Ibid.4. See *Book of the Discipline*, V.p.6

kammas mentioned earlier, barring the Paṭisāraṇiya. The Pabbājaniya-kamma has besides these a few additions of its own which may be summed up as frivolity and misdemeanour through word and deed.¹

The Paṭisāraṇiya-kamma or the Act of Reconciliation is in a class by itself, in that it concerns itself solely with the relations of the monk with the laymen so far as he tends to damage the interests of the laymen and abuses the Buddha, Dhamma and the Saṅgha in their presence. This punishment may be carried out on any monk who is guilty of any one of the offences mentioned in the two following groups:²

- D.
 1. If he tries for non-receiving of gains by householders.
 2. If he tries for non-profiting by householders.
 3. If he tries for non-residence for householders.
 4. If he reviles and abuses householders.
 5. If he causes householder to break with householder.

- E.
 1. If he speaks dispraise of the Buddha to householders.
 2. If he speaks dispraise of the Dhamma to householders.
 3. If he speaks dispraise of the Saṅgha to householders.
 4. If he jeers at a householder with a low thing, if he scoffs at him with a low thing.

¹ Ibid.13f.

² Ibid.18f. See *Book of the Discipline*, V.p.26 f.

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

5. If he does not fulfil a promise made in accordance with the rules to the laymen.

Some of these vicious aspects of character for which these punishments are laid down are, however, not unknown to the Pātimokkha where they are recorded with a different emphasis in relation to its own regulations. These, when viewed in their entirety, are weaknesses which would possibly arise among the members of the Saṅgha and are harmful to their religious perfection as well as the solidarity and well-being of their communal life against which not only the Vinaya but also some of the Suttas are eloquent.

Of these, the first and the most outstanding is the group of faults consisting of making strife, quarrels and disputes, and raising legal questions in the Saṅgha. These are listed among the conditions which justify prosecution under four out of the five *kamma*. Monks who are makers of strife seem to have been a positive danger both to the religion and to the monastic organization not only among the Buddhists but in other religious groups as well. It is recorded in the Sāmagāma Sutta that soon after the death of Nigaṇṭhanātaputta, his disciples were divided and they quarrelled and disputed and reviled each other on what they called differences of opinion with regard to the teachings of their master (*Tena kho pana samayena nigaṇṭho nātaputto pāvāyaṃ adhunā kālakato hoti. Tassa kālakiriyāya*

bhinnā nigaṇṭhā dvedhikajātā bhaṇḍanajātā kalahajātā vivādāpannā aññamaññaṃ mukhasattīhi vitudentā viharanti na tvaṃ imaṃ dhammavinayaṃ ājānāsi ahaṃ dhammavinayaṃ ājānāmi.....niggahīto'si cara vādappamokkhāya nibbeṭhehi vā sace pahosīti. M.II.243). Thus they completely lost favour with their lay-followers. (Ye pi nigaṇṭhassa nātaputtassa sāvakā gihī odātavasanā te'pi nigaṇṭhesu nātaputtiyesu nibbinnarupā virattarūpā paṭivānarupā yathā taṃ durakkhāte dhammavinaye... bhinnathūpe appaṭisaraṇe. Ibid.244).

The arrogance and intolerance with which the fellow-religionists despised the views of one another seems to have been the cause of most of these contentions. The Bahuvédaniya Sutta gives a very realistic analysis of the cause of such disputes.¹ There the Buddha says that as far as his teaching is concerned, one should respect and endorse another's views if they conform to the proper canons. In the absence of such mutual respect and tolerance, the inevitable result would be strife and disunity, and people would go about attacking one another with pungent words. The Upakkilesa Sutta records one such instance where disturbances took place in alarming proportions during the life-time of the Buddha himself (*Ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā kosambiyaṃ viharati*

¹ M.I.398

ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena kosambiyaṃ bhikkhū bhaṇḍanajātā kalahajātā vivādāpannā aññamaññaṃ mukhasattīhi vitudentā viharanti. M.III.152). The Buddha, being unable to settle the dispute, leaves Kosambi in despair and comes to Pācīnavaṃsadāya where the three disciples Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila are living in perfect concord (*Taggha mayaṃ bhante samaggā sammodamānā avivadamānā khīrodakībhūtā aññamaññaṃ piyacakkhūhi sampassantā viharāmā'ti.* Ibid.156). They tell the Buddha that the secret of their success is mutual respect and consideration, and their determination to eliminate the spirit of self assertion. 'We value the company of our fellow-celibates ', each one of them says, and we bear nothing but love towards them in thought, word and deed at all times. We willingly fall in line with their likes and dislikes, and thus though we are many in body are only one in mind (*So kho ahaṃ bhante sakaṃ cittaṃ nikkhipivā imesaṃ yeva āyasmantānaṃ cittaṃ vasena vattāmi. Nānā hi kho no bhante kāyā ekañ ca pana mañña cittaṃ'ti.* Ibid.) We also find this story recorded in the Vinaya Piṭaka.¹

Speaking of the danger of disputes among the members of the Saṅgha, the Buddha says in the Sāmagāma Sutta that he

¹ Vin.I.351f.

considers the disputes over disciplinary matters (*ajjhājīve vā adhipātimokkhe vā*) to be trifling when compared with possible disputes about the teaching or the religious life (*magge vā paṭipadāya vā*) which would lead to the detriment and degeneration of great many beings.¹ There is little doubt that the Buddha considered complete discipline in thought, word and deed as essential for all progress. But the above comments clearly show the relatively secondary importance which the Buddha attached to discipline in its mere outward form in contrast to the more fundamental teachings of the doctrine and their practice in the religious life. The Sutta makes a plea, and no legislation, for the elimination of the causes of these disputes which it analyses as consisting of the following:²

1. Anger and ill will: *kodhano hoti upanāhī*
2. Hypocrisy and malice: *makkhī hoti palāsī*
3. Jealousy and envy: *issukī hoto maccharī*
4. Deceit and fraud: *sañho hoti māyāvī*
5. Evil intentions and false beliefs: *pāpiccho hoti micchādīṭṭhī*

¹ M.II.245

² Ibid.245-46

6. Obstinacy and dogmatism: *sandiṭṭhaparāmasī hoti ādhānagāhī duppaṭinissaggī*

The perpetuation of such vicious traits by those leading the monastic life, it is said, leads to their lack of respect and regard for the Buddha, Dhamma and the Saṅgha and also to the neglect of their own religious life. It is in such a state of affairs that disputes and quarrels would arise among the members of the Saṅgha (*Yo so ānanda bhikkhu kodhano hoti upanāhī ... so satthari'pi agāravo viharati appatisso dhamme'pi ... saṅghe'pi ... sikkhāya'pi na paripūrakārī hoti ... so saṅghe vivādaṃ janeti.* M.II.245f.). Thus we see that the Suttas approach the problem from a different angle. Leaving it to the Vinaya to legislate against such indiscipline the Suttas analyse the causes of these and attempt to remedy them by advocating personal inner development.

There are some items in the Pātimokkha which seem to be related in some ways to those monastic failings, viz. disputes etc., referred to above.¹ Their inclusion in the Pātimokkha reveals the fact that they were not only prevalent in the early days of the Sāsana when the Pātimokkha was being evolved,

¹ See Saṅgh.8-12; P āc.2, 3,17, 63, 71, 76, 78

but that they were also considered serious enough in their day to be legislated against. Thus a number of minor regulations which are calculated to arrest such indiscipline expressing itself in different ways have come to be laid down. Although the violation of most of these regulations entail no serious punishments, they certainly reveal a stricter and sterner attitude to monastic indiscipline than the Suttas, which counted more on appeals and admonitions for ethical re-orientation. In addition to these disputes which are referred to both in the Vinaya and in the Suttas as *bhaṇḍana*, *kalaha*, and *vivāda*, we find litigiousness (*saṅghe adhikaraṇakāraka*) too, added to this group at times.¹ The need for this addition evidently arose as a safeguard against the abuse of the machinery which is set up for the maintenance of monastic discipline. The history of Saṅghādisesa 8 clearly shows how jealous and embittered persons within the monastic community may, in a spirit of revenge, misuse the law.²

A close scrutiny of the details of these *kamma* show that they give to these Acts the widest scope and unrestricted authority for prosecution and punishment in the interests of the religion and the monastic organization. Development of

¹ A.III.252; Vin.II.4

² Vin.III.158

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

character and cultivation of the religious life, fitting into the harmonious life of the community, maintaining proper relations with the laymen, all these come within the jurisdiction of these *Kamma*. They also watch over the loyalty to the religion and the Order to which the members belong. The Paṭisāraṇiyakamma makes special provision to safeguard the interests of the laymen in the hands of the monks. The monks are forbidden to do anything which damages the interests of the laymen or to bring about a cleavage between the religion and its lay patrons.

We give below the special situations in which these *kamma* as forms of punishment are said to have had their origin.

Punishment	Offence	Persons concerned
Tajjaniya: Act of Censure	Being quarrelsome and litigant	Followers of Paṇduka and Lohitaka who instigate other monks to fight and revolt. Vin. II. 1 f.

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

<i>Nissaya</i> : Act of Subordination which compels the offender to live under the tutelage of another	Ignorance and indiscipline	Ven. Seyyasaka who was stupid and constantly committed offences and did not conduct himself properly with the laymen. Ibid. 7 f.
<i>Pabbājaniya</i> : Act of Puni- shment which removes the offender from the area of his residence	Bringing the families of the area into disrepute by their own bad behaviour	Followers of Assaji and Punabbasu who by their licentious behaviour corrupted the lay patrons of Kīṭāgiri. Ibid. 9 f.
<i>Pañisāraōiya</i> : Act of Reconciliation which requires the offender to apologise to the aggrieved party	Strained relations with the laymen	Ven. Sudhamma who abused the householder Citta who was his lay patron. Ibid.15 f.

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

<i>Ukkhepaniya</i> : Act of Suspension whereby the offender is temporarily barred from the company of monks in accepting or giving food, in religious discussions and in ceremonial acts of the Saṅgha. This act is further characterised by the proclamation which is to be issued to all monasteries giving the name of the monk on whom this boycott has been imposed.	Refusal to admit or atone for one's offences or false views regarding the Dhamma.	Ven. Channa who refused to admit his offence and atone for it and Ven. Ariṭṭha who refused to give up his heresy. Ibid.21f, 25f.
---	---	--

The most comprehensive chapter in Buddhist monastic legislation comes to us in the Khandhakas under the section

Chapter XI - Additional Punitive Regulations

known as the Samathakkhandhaka.¹ This deals with seven different ways (*satta adhikaraṇasamatha*) by means of which, it is claimed, that all forms of disciplinary action within the monastic community could be carried out. The seven Adhikaraṇasamathas are as follows.²

1. *Sammukhāvinaya* : `by a verdict in the presence of' Vin.II.73f.
2. *Sativinaya* : `by a verdict of innocence' Ibid.74-80
3. *Amūlhavinaya* : `by a verdict of past insanity' Ibid.80-83
4. *Paṭṭhiññātakaraṇa* : `the carrying out on the acknowledgement' Ibid.83 f.
5. *Yebhuyyasikā* : `by the decision of the majority' Ibid.84f.
6. *Tassapāpiyyasikā* : `by an act of condemnation for specific depravity' Ibid.85f.
7. *Tiṇavatthāraka* : `by the covering up with grass' Ibid.86-88

¹ Vin.II.73-104

² See *Book of the Discipline*, V.pp.96-140

These lay down procedure for the correction of monastic indiscipline, for the settlement of disputes and strifes among the members of the Saṅgha, and for the valid execution of monastic Acts. There is very little doubt about the recognition and prestige which this section of the law enjoyed from the earliest times. For Adhikaraṇas seem to have been a matter of common occurrence even in the early days of the Sāsana. The word is used in the sense of going into litigation, of charging a fellow-member of the Saṅgha with an offence, maliciously or with valid reasons. The text of Saṅghādīsesa 8 bears testimony to this. (*Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhuṃ duṭṭho doso appatīto amūlakena pārājikena dhammena anuddhamseyya app'eva nāma naṃ imamhā brahmacariyā cāveyyan'ti. Tato aparena samayena samanuggāhiyamāno vā asamanuggāhiyamāno vā amūlakñ c'eva taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ hoti bhikkhu ca dosaṃ patitthāti saṅghādīseso.* Vin.III.163). In the Kakacūpama Sutta, the monk Moliyaphagguna accuses, in a spirit of retaliation, his fellow brethren who criticise the conduct of the nuns with whom he closely associates (*Sace ko ci bhikkhu āyasmato moliyaphaggunassa sammukhā tāsam bhikkhunīnaṃ avaṇṇaṃ bhāsati ten'āyasmā moliyaphagguno kupito anattamano adhikaraṇaṃ'pi karoti.* M.I.122). It is felt that this litigant character of individual monks is not a healthy sign and much is said in praise of those who refrain from such litigations and

advocate the effective termination of such conditions wherever they appear (*Yam'pi bhikkhave bhikkhu na adhikaraṇiko hoti adhikaraṇasamathassa vaṇṇavādī ayam'pi dhammo piyattāya garuttāya bhāvanāya sāmaññāya ekībhāvāya samvattati.* A.V.167). The skill in arresting the rise of such disputes and disturbances is considered a qualification for election to responsible monastic positions such as membership in a committee of arbitration which is known as Ubbāhikā (*Dasah' aṅgehi samannāgato bhikkhu ubbūhikāya sammannitabbo.....adhikaraṇasamuppāda-vūpasamanakusalo hoti....*Vin.II.95; A.V.71). It also leads to the personal well-being of the members of the monastic community (*Dasahi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato thero bhikkhu yassaṃ yassaṃ disāyaṃ viharati phāsu yeva viharati. Katamehi dasahi... adhikaraṇasamuppādavūpasamakusalo hoti.* A.V.201).

These seven modes of Adhikaraṇasamatha are referred to both in the Suttas and in the Vinaya. (*Satta kho pan' ime ānanda akhikaraṇasamathā uppannuppannānaṃ adhikaraṇānaṃ samathāya vūpasamāya. Sammukhāvinayo dātabbo sativinayo dātabbo amūlḥavinayo dātabbo paṭiññāya kāretabbaṃ yebhuyyasikā tassa pāpiyyasikā tiṇavatthārako.* M.II.247. See also D.III.254; A.IV.1.44; Vin.II.73-104; IV.207).

We shall first examine them as they are presented to us in the Vinaya Piṭaka.¹ The first of these, the Sammukhāvinaya, recognises the principle that no penalties or punishments should be imposed on an offender in his absence (*Na bhikkhave asammukhībhūtānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ kammaṃ kātabbaṃ tajjanīyaṃ vā nissayaṃ vā pabbājanīyaṃ vā paṭisāraṇīyaṃ vā ukkhepanīyaṃ vā. Yo kareyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. Vin.II.73*). Paṭiññātakaraṇa which appears as the fourth in the Vinaya text provides that such disciplinary action should also be taken with the acknowledgement of the guilty monk. (*Na bhikkhave apaṭiññāya bhikkhūnaṃ kammaṃ kātabbaṃ tajjanīyaṃ vā... ukkhepanīyaṃ vā. Yo kareyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. Vin.II.83*). Both these conditions are regarded as essential to give validity to the daṇḍakamma or acts of punishment which are outside the regulations of the Pātimokkha in their origin and character. Failure to comply with these requirements would render such an act invalid.² In the fourfold division of the adhikaraṇas, this latter form of samatha, namely Paṭiññātakaraṇa seems also to be made use of in the settlement of Āpattādhikaraṇa which is almost entirely based on

¹ Vin.II.73ff.

² Ibid.3

the Pātimokkha.¹ Sammukhāvinaya, on the other hand, is a prerequisite in the settlement of all the four forms of *adhikaraṇa*.

Tassapāpiyyasikā which is listed as No. 6 under the *Adhikaraṇasamatha* seems to be very different from the rest in that it has a great deal more in common with the *daṇḍakamma* as a means of maintaining order in the community. In fact, both *Samanta-pāsādikā* and *Vimativinodanī* consider this to be on the same footing as the other *daṇḍakamma*. Speaking of the *Tassapāpiyyasikā*, the *Samantapāsādikā* says that the details concerning this are the same as in the *Tajjaniya* and other *daṇḍakamma* (*Sesaṃ ettha tajjanīyādisu vuttanayaṃ eva. VinA.VI.1193*). The *Vimativinodanī* elaborates further on this comment and says that this is intended to serve as an act of prosecution whereby it would be possible to punish an offender who refuses to accept the judgement of the Saṅgha. (*Sesaṃ ettha tajjanīyādisu vuttanayam evā'ti etena tajjanīyādisattakammāni viya idam pi tassapāpiyyasikākammam asucibhāvādidosaṃyuttassa saṅghassa ca vinicchaye atitṭhamānassa kattabbaṃ visuṃ ekaṃ niggaḥakammaṃ'ti dasseti. Vimativinodani.452.f.*). It is virtually an act of condemnation carried out on a monk for corrupt, shameless and reprehensible behaviour. It is also carried out on one who

¹ Ibid.102 and 88

deliberately lies and attempts to evade a charge laid upon him.¹ The details of the offences for which it is imposed and the proper mode of conducting oneself under this penalty are identical, more or less, with those of the other *daṇḍakamma*.² It lays down no specific punishment but it was perhaps used more effectively as a general act of stigmatisation whereby a vociferous offender was prevented from evading prosecution with a garrulous defence. This stigmatisation would forthwith arrest such indiscipline. The Vimativinodanī confirms this view (*Etasmim hi niggahakamme kate so puggalo ahaṃ suddho'ti attano suddhiyā sādhanatthaṃ saṅghamajjhaṃ otaṛitum saṅgho c'assa vinicchayaṃ dātum na labhati taṃkammakaraṇamatten'eva ca taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasantaṃ hoti*. Vimt.453). Accordig to the Kaṅkhāvitaraī it would result in the complete elimination from the monastic community of a Pārājika offender or the possible correction of a lesser offence committed by one of its members. (*Yadā pana pārājikena vā pārājikāsāmantena vā codiyamānassa aññen'aññaṃ paṭicarato pāp'ussannattā pāpiyassa puggalassa sac'āyaṃ acchinnamūlo bhavissati sammā vattitvā osaraṇaṃ labhissati*. *Sace chinnamūlo ayam 'ev'assa nāsanā bhavissati'ti maññaṃāno*

¹ Vin.II.85

² Ibid.4-5; also 86

saṅgho ñatticatutthena kammaena tassapāpiyyasikaṃ kammaṃ karoti. Kkvt.155) .

On the other hand, Sativinaya and Amūlḥavinaya provide against any possible miscarriage of justice in the monastic administration. The legal machinery it to be operated with humane considerations and it is not to be abused through malice, jealousy or prejudice. Sativinaya is intended for the exoneration of a guiltless monk who is falsely accused by malicious parties.¹ This absolution from guilt is to be conferred, relying on the mental alertness of the person concerned (*Sativepullappattassa sativinayaṃ dadeyya.* Vin.II.80). According to the Samantapāsādikā, this is then applicable only to the Arahants and to none below that level of perfection and reliability (*Ayaṃ pana sativinayo khīṇāsavass'eva dātabbo na aññassa antamaso anāgāmino'pi.* VinA.VI.1192). It is to be carried out by a competent body of monks at the request of the aggrieved person.² The Amūlḥavinaya seeks exemption for offences committed in a state of unsound mind. The Bhikkhu who is guilty of such an offence, on regaining his mental equilibrium, confesses to the Saṅgha the circumstances under which the offence came to be committed and states that he

¹ Ibid.78ff.

² Ibid.80

does not remember it thereafter. In spite of this consideration, it is added, he may be wrongfully prosecuted for the same. The Amūlḥavinaya provides the exoneration of such a monk from the guilt of an offence committed in a state of unsound mind. But it is to be applied only in *bona fide* cases and the Vinaya legislates against offenders taking shelter under this, claiming falsely a lapse of memory or pretending to be of unsound mind.¹ Under such circumstances the exercise of this power is declared to be illegal.²

The Yebhuyyasikā and the Tiṇavatthāraka as disciplinary measures are different from the rest of the Adhikaraṇasamathas in that they are not only interested in safeguarding the moral tone of the character of individuals but also are concerned with settling their disputes and adjudicating over breaches of discipline in such a way that the concord of the monastic community may not be impaired. This is the dominant note of the Tiṇavatthāraka. It does recognise the existence of contending parties in the Saṅgha and the possible break up of the monastic unity through their factional differences. Under such circumstances, even in the face of offences committed (*bahuṃ assāmaṇakaṃ ajjhāciṇṇaṃ hoti*

¹ Ibid.82

² Ibid.

bhāsitaparikantaṃ. Vin.II.86), the members of one faction shall not proceed to institute disciplinary action against members belonging to the other group for fear of breaking the unity of the Saṅgha (*Sace mayam imāhi āpattīhi aññamaññaṃ kāreyyāma siyā'pi tam adhikaraṇaṃ kakkaḷattāya vālattāya bhedāya samvatteyya*. Ibid.). But both parties are to meet in the full assembly of the Saṅgha, and with the consent of the Saṅgha agree to have the offences committed by their members dealt with by means of this collective disciplinary measure known as 'covering up with grass' (*Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho imam adhikaraṇaṃ tiṇavatthārakena sameyya thapetvā thūlavajjaṃ thapetvā ghipaṭisaṃyuttan'ti*. Ibid.87). The leaders of the two factions would obtain the sanction of their groups to declare before the Saṅgha, for this purpose, the offences committed by themselves as well as by the members of their respective groups (*Ekato pakkhikānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vyattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena sako pakkho ñāpetabbo... yad'āyasmantānaṃ pattakallaṃ ahaṃ yā c' eva āyasmantānaṃ āpatti yā ca attano āpatti āyasmantānañ c'eva atthāya attano ca atthāya sṅghamajjhe tiṇavatthārakena deseyyaṃ*. Ibid.). The offences which could be treated in this manner were invariably minor in character in that they excluded the major offences

(*thullavajja*) which the Samantapāsādikā explains as Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa.¹ It was also necessary that these breaches of discipline did not involve the laymen (*gihipaṭisaṃyuttam*). It is claimed that by this process of Tiṇavatthāraka all participants are absolved of their guilt of any transgression, barring those specified above. Absentees and dissentients do not benefit by this (*Evañ ca pana bhikkhave te bhikkhū tāhi āpattīhi vuṭṭhitā honti ṭhapetvā thūlavajjaṃ ṭhapetvā diṭṭhāvikkammaṃ ṭhapetvā ye na tattha hontīti*. Vin.II.88).

The Yebhuyyasikā as described in the Khandhakas is perhaps the most complex of all the Adhikaraṇasamathas. It is worked out in a rather protracted manner and is resorted to only after the failure of other methods. When it has been found that it is not possible to settle a monastic dispute within the confines of the monastery where it occurred by the method of Sammukhāvinaya, the Khandhakas suggest that those Bhikkhus who are connected with it should take the matter to the members of another monastery who are greater in number, and by mutual agreement the monks who are the hosts would settle the dispute.² However, it is added that such a large group might possibly become unweildy and that no useful purpose

¹ VinA.VI.1194

² Vin.II.94

would be served by deliberations in such an assembly. In such a situation the monks are empowered to refer the matter to a select committee (*ubbāhikā*) for a settlement (*Sammato saṅghena itthannāmo ca itthannāmo ca bhikkhū ubbāhikāya imam adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasametum*. Vin.II.96). Ten qualifications are insisted on for consideration for membership in such a committee. These cover not only good and virtuous conduct but also a thorough knowledge of the Dhamma and the Vinaya. Every member of such a committee had also to be a good judge and authority on the exercise of disciplinary powers.¹ If it is discovered that the dispute cannot be settled in this manner, it must be referred back to the whole Saṅgha for settlement by the decision of the majority (*yebhuyyasikā*). In the description of the Adhikaraṇasamatha in the Khandhakas we find that the Yebhuyyasikā assumes a more restricted connotation in contrast to its description in the Sutta version.² It is claimed to be an act whereby the Saṅgha assures itself that, at the time of a division, the righteous monks would be in the majority.³ Thus it is not a decision arrived at by merely taking a vote. The Samantapāsādikā reiterates the same idea (*Yebhuyyasikāya*

¹ Ibid.95

² *Infra* p.126

³ Vin.II.92

vūpasametun'ti ettha yassa kiriyāya dhammavādino bahutarā esā yebhuyyasikā nāma. VinA.VI.1192). By the method of direct and indirect canvassing the Saṅgha must assure itself of a majority for the righteous cause.

For this purpose three forms of voting are recommended. They are secret ballot (*gūlhaka*), whispering in the ear (*sakaṇṇajappaka*) and open ballot (*vivaṭaka*). A reliable monk who is not inclined to err on account of his partialities or prejudices (*chandā dosā*), confusion or fear (*mohā bhayā*) and who is capable of reckoning the votes as they are cast (*gahitāgahitañ ca jāneyya*) is appointed to distribute the ballot-sticks (*salākagāhāpaka*).¹ In the case of secret ballot, two distinct groups of ballot-sticks have to be used (*salākāyo vaṇṇāvaṇṇāyo katvā* - Vin.II.99). The Commentary on the above statement takes *vaṇṇāvaṇṇāyo* to mean that the sticks of each group bear a special sign on them and look different (*Vaṇṇāvaṇṇāyo katvā'ti dhammavādīnañ ca adhammavādīnañ ca salākāyo nimittasaññaṃ āropetvā visabhāgā kāretabbā* - VinA.VI.1198). The Vimativinodanī adds that these differences may be slight or great (*Vaṇṇāvaṇṇāyo katvā'ti khuddakamahantehi saññāṇehi yuttāyo katvā ten'āha nimittasaññaṃ āropetvā'ti.* Vimt.456). Going up to each monk in

¹ Vin.II.84

turn, the *salākagāhāpaka*, i. e. the one who distributes ballot sticks, should introduce the ballot-sticks and ask him to take the one of his choice. Once the voter has made a decision he is asked not to show his voting stick to any other. At this stage, if the *salākagāhāpaka* knows that the unrighteous monks are in the majority, he should then declare the voting null and void on grounds of incorrect procedure and set about taking a vote over again (...*duggahito'ti paccukkaḍḍhitabbaṃ*. Vin.II.99). But if the righteous monks are in the majority, even by a single vote, then he should announce that the voting has been valid (*Ekasmim'pi dhammavādismim atireke jāte suggahitā salākāyo'ti sāvetabbaṃ*. VinA.VI.1198). The Sakaṇṇajappakasalākagāha or the method of voting by whispering in the ear is different from the former only in so far as the announcement to each monk is made in a whisper and he is asked not to inform the others of his decision (*Gahite vattabbo mā kassa ci ārocehī'ti*. Vin.II.99). The Vivaṭakasalākagāha or the method of voting by open ballot is adopted only where a majority of righteous monks is assured.

The Samantapāsādikā seems to know a great deal more about the art of securing a majority for what it calls the just cause. It allows a fresh vote to be taken up to a third time with the hope of securing a majority, dismissing the former on grounds of incorrect procedure. But if no majority is secured as desired even at the third voting, the assembly should then

adjourn with the idea of meeting again the next day. This would give time and opportunity to the righteous monks to canvass support for their cause before the next vote is taken and be able thereby to shatter the opposition (*Atha yāvataṭṭiyam'pi adhammavādino bahutarā'va honti aṭṭha akālo sve jānissāmā'ti vuṭṭhahitvā alajjīnaṃ pakkhaṃ vibhedatthāya dhammavādipakkhaṃ pariyesitvā punadvase salākagāho kātabbo*. VinA.VI.1198). Under the Sakaṇṇajappaka form of voting too, the Samantapāsādikā has a very similar comment which reflects the same spirit of defending by all possible means what is chosen to be the righteous position. *Gahite vattabbo* of the text quoted above¹ which is applicable in general to all monks of the assembly during the Sakaṇṇajappakasālākagāha is commented on in the Samantapāsādikā as referring to a special situation, viz. the vote of the Saṅghatthera or the president of the assembly. It is said that if he chooses to vote on the side of the unrighteous monks, it should be pointed out to him that it is not in keeping with his age or seniority. Thereafter, if he decides to vote with the righteous monks, a voting-stick of the right kind should be provided. If he does not change his mind, on the other hand, he should be asked to keep his decision a secret.

¹ Ibid.99

The interest in the Adhikaraṇasamathas as measures for the settlement of disciplinary matters in the Saṅgha is further enhanced when we compare and contrast the details regarding these in the Suttas and in the Vinaya. The lists of Adhikaraṇasamathas which are given in Pali literature, both Sutta and Vinaya, are identical in all cases. However, the descriptions of the Adhikaraṇasamathas given in the Sāmagāma Sutta¹ seem to be in marked contrast to the account in the Khandhakas.² One is immediately impressed by the simplicity of these disciplinary measures as they are described in the Sutta account. The monastic irregularities which come under review and the manner of dealing with them here are far from the complexity which one associates with these in the Khandhakas. Allusions to the imposition of *daṇḍakamma* are conspicuous by their absence in the Sutta account. It does not seem to portray such a phase of the Saṅgha when the imposition of formal acts of punishment on its members had become a regular feature. On the other hand, what appears to us from the Sutta account is the desire of the members to remedy and rectify any errors and irregularities that might appear in the Saṅgha and the frankness and willingness

¹ M.II.247

² Vin.II.73ff.

with which these are confessed and atoned for in the company of the fellow members. This difference in the enforcement of discipline comes out with marked emphasis on a study of the form of the Adhikaraṇasamatha known as Paṭiññātakaraṇa. The primary interest of the Khandhakas in this form is for the proper imposition of daṇḍakammas. The Khandhakas insist that under the Paṭiññātakaraṇa no punishment or penalty (i.e. the *daṇḍakamma* mentioned earlier) is to be imposed without the offender admitting his fault. It is essentially a matter of procedure in monastic disciplinary action. On the other hand, the Sutta account takes it as a way in which the repetition of monastic offences may be averted. It seems to provide adequately against what is described as Āpattādhikaraṇa or offences against the injunctions of the Pātimokkha. A monk who has committed such an offence, whether urged by others or not, recognises it and confesses his guilt. He is then asked to address himself to a senior member of the Order, and owning and admitting his offence, undertake to guard himself in the future. Thus the occurrence and perpetuation of monastic offences would be eliminated.

It is also with the same purpose in mind, as in the case of the Paṭiññātakaraṇa, that the Khandhakas take up the Sammukhāvinaya. Here too, it is the proper execution of the *daṇḍakamma* that seems to engage the attention of the

Khandhakas. But the Sutta account, once again, has no reference whatsoever here to the *daṇḍamma*. It looks upon the Sammukhāvinaya as a disciplinary measure related directly to Vivādādhikaraṇa or disturbances in the monastic community arising out of disputes concerning the doctrine or monastic discipline. Under the Sammukhāvinaya, the Sutta recommends that in such a situation all monks should meet together and settle such disputes correctly in a way that would accord with the Dhamma, perhaps here in the broader sense which includes the Vinaya as well. The Sutta suggests that monks should, at such a meeting, apply the criteria of the Dhamma (*dhammanetti*) and straighten out the differences in conformity to it (*Tehi ānanda bhikkhūhi sabbeh'eva samaggehi sannipatitabbaṃ sannipatitvā dhammanetti samanumajjitabbā dhammanettiṃ samanumajjitvā yathā tatha sameti tathā taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasametabbaṃ. Evaṃ kho ānanda sammukhāvinayo hoti. M.II.247.*). The commentary on the above passage also takes this allusion to mean a careful and sensible scrutiny to the situation with the criteria of the dhamma (*Dhammanetti samanumajjitabbā'ti dhammarajju anumajjitabbā ñāṇena ghaṃsitabbā upaparikkhitabbā.. MA.IV.48*).

The Suta account recommends that this same method be adopted for the Yebhuysasikā too. If the monks in a particular monastic residence are unable to settle a monastic dispute

among themselves, then they are asked to seek the assistance of monks in another monastery where they are greater in number. However, the method of deciding such issues by voting as in the Khandhakas is not envisaged here. The limitations of such a routine method were perhaps too obvious. It is not the mere mechanism of procedure that is vital here. The monastic ideals are to be safeguarded at all costs. Once the method of voting is adopted, and this is the stage the Yebhuyyasikā has reached in the Khandhakas, one could not hazard any miscarriage of justice by relying solely on the externals of procedure. This naturally necessitated the practice of canvassing for the righteous cause, for the spirit of democracy in the Saṅgha, in any case, had to be channelled for the achievement of its worthy ideals.

In the Sutta account both Amūḷhavinaya and Tassapāpiyyasikā bring before us miscreants who try to defend themselves by denying the charges brought against them. The Tassapāpiyyasikā in particular is calculated to tighten the ring round such evasive characters (*Taṃ enaṃ nibbēhentaṃ ativētheti*. M.II.248). Persuasion and pressure are continuously applied until the offender stands condemned on his own admission. Here it gives no indication of a *daṇḍakamma* whatsoever. Under the Amūḷhavinaya a guilty monk may, under cross examination, adduce a stage of mental derangement as a

mitigating factor. He may thereby be completely absolved. The *Ṭiṇavatthāraka* and the *Sativinaya* remain more or less the same in both the *Sutta* and the *Vinaya* accounts.

The *Adhikaraṇasamathas*, as part of the machinery for the maintenance of monastic discipline, concern themselves with all the four forms of *adhikaraṇa* including *Āpattādhikaraṇa*. Thus they embrace a wider field of activity than the *Pātimokkha*. Hence it is little wonder that the *Pātimokkha*, both as text and as ritual, appended to itself in course of time the *Adhikaraṇasamathas*, although as we have pointed earlier one cannot reckon these items of *Adhikaraṇasamathas* as *sikkhāpada*. Explaining the recital of the *Adhikaraṇasamathas* at the ritual of the *Pātimokkha* (*Ime kho pana āyasmanto satta adhikaraṇasamathadhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti*. Vin.IV.207), Buddhaghosa says that they have to be recited in order to ascertain the purity of the Saṅgha both with regard to the transgressions listed under *Āpattādhikaraṇa* as well as those transgressions which bring about the other three *adhikaraṇas* (*Uddesaṃ āgacchantī ti āpattādhikaraṇasaṅkhātāsu avasesādhikaraṇa-ttaya-paccayāsu ca āpattisu parisuddhabhāvapucchanatthaṃ uddisitabbaṃ āgacchanti*. Kkv.153). As a result of this very close association of the *Adhikaraṇasamathas* with the ritual of the *Pātimokkha* they evidently came to be identified, perhaps in some circles, as a

part of the text of the Pātimokkha. Buddhaghosa's analysis of the contents of the two Vibhaṅgas in the Samantapāsādikā makes no discrimination against them.¹ However, in the Sumangalavilasini Buddhaghosa does not add the seven Adhikaraṇasamathas in totalling up the *sikkhāpada* of the Vibhaṅgas.²

Whatever might have been the original intention of reading out the list of Adhikaraṇasamathas at the Pātimokkha ritual the point of interest here is the manner in which this new addition is integrated to form a whole with the body of *sikkhāpada* which formed the contents of the early recital. At the ritual of the Pātimokkha, after the recital of the Adhikaraṇasamathas too, the question regarding the purity of the members of the assembly which had been asked with regard to each category of offences in the Pātimokkha is addressed to the Saṅgha once again: *Uddiṭṭhā kho āyasmanto satta adhikaraṇasamathā dhammā. Tattha āyasmante pucchāmi kacci'ttha parisuddhā.* Vin.IV.207.

These Adhikaraṇasamathas are clearly not offences but are only ways by means of which the collective organization of the

¹ VinA.I.14f.

² DA.I.13

Saṅgha may arrive at a settlement of monastic disputes and disturbances including the commission of offences (*āpattādhikaraṇa*). Hence we would normally expect the purpose of the above question to be to ascertain whether there has been any irregularity of procedure in the settlement of monastic disputes among the members of the Saṅgha. If that were so we would regard this extension of the process of questioning as an attempt to safeguard the machinery set up for the maintenance of monastic discipline. In this case it would be the Saṅgha as a whole and not individual monks who would be held responsible. On the other hand, it could also be a mere mechanical extension of the method of questioning which was applied to the earlier groups of *sikkhāpada*. The Mahāsaṅghikas show a further extension of this process of questioning. They go beyond the Adhikaraṇasamathas to apply the question of purity in terms of a new group of their own which they call *dharma* and *anudharma*.¹

However, in the absence of any conclusive evidence regarding the inclusion of Adhikaraṇasamathas in the recital of the Pātimokkha we have to fall back on the tradition of the commentators who preserve for us at least their view of contemporary trends. Buddhaghosa attempts to explain this

¹ *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, vol.X. Appendix.

final questioning at the end of the Pātimokkha recital as being calculated to cover all offences coming under the four *adhikaraṇa* (*Tatthāyasmante pucchāmi kacci'ttha parisuddhā'ti tesu sattasu adhikaraṇasamathesu kacci'ttha parisuddhā. Natthi vo kiñci samathehi vupasametabban'ti pucchāmi etena sabbāpattīhi parisuddhabhāvo pucchito hoti.* Kkvt.155f.). At the end of the process of detailed and specific questioning regarding the Āpattādhikaraṇa which takes place through the recital of each category of *sikkhāpada* in the Pātimokkha, Buddhaghosa regards this scrutiny under the Adhikaraṇasamatha as being the grand finale of the ritual of the Pātimokkha.

CHAPTER XII
Spiritual Leadership
and Life in the Community

From the earliest times the Buddha was undoubtedly accepted as the leader of all the disciples who took to the monastic life. The venerable Assaji, who was one of the first five disciples of the Buddha, revealed this position to Sāriputta Paribbājaka (*Atth'āvuso mahāsamaṇo sakyaputto sakyakulā pabbajito taṃ bhagavantam uddissa pabbajito. So ca me bhagavā satthā tassa cā'haṃ bhagavato dhammaṃ rocemīti.* Vin.II.40). Even after the community of the Saṅgha increased in number and spread over wider regions this basic position remained unaltered. In the Bhayabherava Sutta, the Brahmin Jāṇussoṇi expresses the same view regarding the leadership of the Buddha and the Buddha himself is seen confirming it (*Ye'me bho gotama kulaputtā bhavantam gotamaṃ uddissa saddhā agāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajitā bhavaṃ tesam gotamo pubbaṅgamo bhavaṃ tesam gotamo bahukāro bhavaṃ gotamo samādapetā bho ca pana gotamassa sā janatā diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjati'ti. Evam'etaṃ brāhmaṇa evam'etaṃ brāhmaṇa. Ye te brāhmaṇa..... āpajjati'ti.* M.I.16).

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

However, as we have pointed out elsewhere, it was never the Buddha's desire to exercise too much personal control over the Saṅgha, either by himself or through his nominees.¹ The Buddha is, in fact, happy that at an early stage in the history of the Sāsana he was able to discipline his disciples with the minimum instructions: *Na me tesu bhikkhusu anusāsaniṅ karaṇīyā ahoṣi*. M.I.124. On the other hand, it is the wish of the disciples that the Buddha should instruct them:... *aññad'atthu mamaṃ yeva sāvakaṃ anusāsaniṃ paccāsiṃsanti*. M.II.10. The disciples derived great benefits from the Teacher who placed them on the correct path to spiritual perfection. The disciples in turn emulated their Master and modelled their lives after him. The Gopakamoggallāna Sutta goes on to say that the disciples, however, never equalled the Master. As the founder of the way, he was supremely above them. They come as followers to pursue the path which was indicated by him.²

As the leader whose concern was the spiritual well-being of his disciples the Buddha always thought it was his duty to keep them reminded of the Norm and to explain to them the way to the perfection of their religious life. Thus he would explain to

¹ D.II.100,154; Vin.II.188

² M.III.8

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

them some point of doctrine as the occasion necessitated and conclude his discourse to them by requesting them to apply themselves to the realisation of the goal which is set out in this teaching. At the end of the Dvedhāvitakka Sutta, the Buddha sums up his position as teacher in the following words: 'Whatever, O monks, has to be done by a kind and compassionate teacher for the good of his disciples, that I have done for you. Here, O monks, are the sylvan retreats and solitary abodes. Be earnestly engaged in the perfection of your religious life. Brook no delay lest you have cause for lament afterwards. This is my advice to you.' (*Yaṃ bhikkhave satthārā karaṇīyaṃ sāvakānaṃ hitesinā anumappaṃ upādāya kataṃ vo taṃ mayā. Etāni bhikkhave rukkhamūlāni etāni suññāgārāni. Jhāyatha bhikkhave mā pamāda'ttha mā pacchā vippaṭṭisārino ahuvattha. Ayaṃ vo amhākaṃ anusāsanīti.* M.I.118). In the Sallekha Sutta the Buddha addresses these same words to Cunda.¹ In the Indriyabhāvanā Sutta he does so after explaining to Ānanda what was regarded in Buddhism as the true cultivation of the senses.²

¹ M.I.46

² M.III.302

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

Not only did the Buddha give counsel himself but he also expected the lives of his disciples to be regulated through the guidance and instruction of other senior members of the Order. The Saṃyutta Nikāya gives a number of instances where the Buddha requests the venerable Mahā Kassapa to admonish the Bhikkhus as much as he does (*Ovada kassapa bhikkhū karohi kassapa bhikkhūnaṃ dhammikathaṃ. Ahaṃ vā kassapa bhikkhū ovadeyyaṃ tvaṃ vā ahaṃ vā bhikkhūnaṃ dhammikathaṃ kareyyaṃ tvaṃ vā'ti.* S.II.203, 205, 208). However, it is said that the venerable Mahā Kassapa declined this invitation saying that the Bhikkhus of the day were not amenable to instruction and were resentful of such advice. It is mentioned repeatedly that he stated that the monks of his day were temperamentally unsuited for such correction (*Dubbacā kho bhante etarahi bhikkhū dovacassakaraṇehi dhammehi samannāgatā akkhamā appadakkhiṇaggāhino anusāsaṇiṃ.* S.II.204, 206, 208). This possible intolerance of advice and correction from fellow members of the community seems to be evident even in the early days of the Sāsana. The history of the Saṅghādisesa 12 shows how the venerable Channa resented such advice from fellow monks.¹ From an analysis of this

¹ Vin.III.177

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

incident and the legislation that followed it becomes clear that in the corporate organization of the Saṅgha every member was expected to contribute his share towards mutual correction of their religious life. Every member was also expected to allow himself to be corrected by others (*Mā'yaśamā attānaṃ avacaṇīyaṃ akāsi vacaṇīyaṃ eva āyaśmā attānaṃ karotu. Āyaśmā'pi bhikkhū vadetu sahadhammena bhikkhū'pi āyaśmantaṃ vakkhanti sahadhammena. Evaṃ saṃvaḍḍhā hi tassa bhagavato parisā yad'idaṃ aṇṇamaṇṇavacanena aṇṇamaṇṇavuṭṭhāpanenā'ti. Vin.III.178*). The Saṅghādisesa rule referred to above makes legal provision to enforce the acceptance of such correction by fellow monks. For he who resists such advice stubbornly up to a third time would be guilty of a Saṅghādisesa offence which, it should be realised, is second only to a Pārājika in its gravity.

Besides this legalised aspect of the acceptance of instruction from fellow members of the community which we find in the Vinaya Piṭaka, we also find in the Sutta Piṭaka numerous references where the willingness to accept instruction is referred to as a great monastic virtue. It is spoken of as leading to unity and concord among the members of the Saṅgha (*Yam'pi bhikkhave bhikkhu suvaco hoti saovacassakaraṇehi*

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

dhammehi samannāgato khamo padakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsanim ayam'pi dhammo sārāṇiyo piyakaraṇo garukaraṇo saṃgahāya avivādāya sāmaggīyā ekībhāvāya saṃvattati. A.V.90). It is also said to contribute to the stability and continuity of the Sāsana for a long time (*Ayam'pi bhikkhave dhammo saddhammassa ṭhitiyā asamosāya anantaradhānāya saṃvattati.* A.II.148; III.180; V.338). Thus we see that in the corporate life of the Saṅgha the offer and acceptance of such advice for mutual welfare became a reality (...*padakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsanin'ti therā'pi naṃ bhikkhu vattabbam anusāsitaṃ maññanti.* A.V.27). This practice, we further discover, had been extended to the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha as well and the Buddha himself is seen requesting the venerable Nandaka to give counsel to the Bhikkhunis. Both the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas bear testimony to the fact that it became a regular feature for the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha to be advised by competent and qualified members of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha. It is also evident that the Bhikkhunis regularly looked forward to it (*Ekamantaṃ ṭhitā kho mahāpajāpatī gotamī bhagavantaṃ etadavoca ovadatu bhante bhagavā bhikkhuniyo anusāsatu bhante bhagavā bhikkhuniyo karotu bhante bhagavā bhikkhunīnaṃ dhammikathan'ti. Tena kho pana samayena therā bhikkhu bhikkhuniyo ovadanti pariyāyena.* M.III.270). In fact, under the third *garudhamma* it is

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

incumbent on the Bhikkhunis to go to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha regularly for *ovāda*.¹

Notwithstanding the venerable Mahā Kassapa's reticence we find a great claim made for the usefulness of such counsel and correction for those who have chosen to lead a life of religious zest. According to the circumstances such *anusāsānī* or counsel would vary in each context. But it was always calculated to guide and direct the disciple who still has to accomplish his avowed mission (Ye kho te brāhmaṇa bhikkhū sekhā appattamānasā anuttaraṃ yogakkhemaṃ patthayamānā viharanti tesu me ayaṃ evarūpī anusāsānī hoti. M. III. 4). Such was the spiritual leadership provided by the Buddha which was respected and recognised quite independent of the subsequent achievements of the disciples. The same Sutta as quoted above makes it clear by saying that even under the guidance of the Buddha himself some disciples may fail to attain Nibbāna. That is how the Tathāgata plays the limited role of a guide (*Evaṃ eva kho brāhmaṇa tiṭṭhat'eva nibbānaṃ tiṭṭhati nibbānagāmī maggo tiṭṭhām'ahaṃ samādapetā. Atha ca pana mama sāvakā mayā evaṃ ovadiyamānā evaṃ anusāsiyamānā*

¹ Vin.II.255

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

appekacce accantaniṭṭhaṃ nibbānaṃ ārādhenti ekacce na ārādhenti. Ettha kvā'haṃ brāhmaṇa karomi maggakkhāyī brāhmaṇa tathāgato'ti. M. III. 6).

It is possible to state that there must have been besides the Buddha a number of senior members of the Saṅgha who were concerned with the progress of the religious life of their fellow members. The two chief disciples of the Buddha, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, no doubt, figure prominent among them. In the Anaṅgana Sutta the venerable Moggallāna himself gives pride of place to the venerable Sāriputta.¹ The venerable Sāriputta gives here his fellow monks a long discourse on the defiling traits of the mind. At the end of it the venerable Moggallāna remarks that Sāriputta's clear analysis served to purge the minds of those disciples who were lacking in faith but had taken to the monastic life to eke out an existence and were corrupt, stupid and undisciplined (*Tesaṃ āyasmā sāriputto iminā dhammapariyāyena hadayā hadayaṃ maññe aññāya tacchati.* M.I.32). The devoted and faithful disciples, Moggallāna further remarks, would relish and rejoice over these words of instruction (*Te āyasmato sāriputtassa imaṃ dhammapariyāyaṃ*

¹ M.I.32

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

sutvā pipanti maññe vacasā c'eva manasā ca. M.I.32). The sole purpose of such instruction is conceived to be the guidance of fellow monks so as to keep them out of evil and place them on the path of virtue (*Sādhu vata bho sabrahmacārī akusalā vuṭṭhāpetvā kusale patitṭhāpeti. Ibid.*).

However, as pointed out by the venerable Mahā Kassapa it has not always been an easy or pleasant task to criticise and correct the conduct of a fellow member, for many miscreants were ill-tempered and resentful of correction. The history of Saṅghādisesa 12 lends further support to this view (*Bhikkhu pan'eva dubbacajātiko hoti uddesapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesu bhikkūhi sahadhammikaṃ vuccamāno attānaṃ avacanīyaṃ karoti mā maṃ āyasmanto kiñci avacuttha kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā aham'p'āyasmante na kiñci vakkhāmi kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā. Viramathāyasmanto mama vacanāyā'ti. Vin.III.178*). The recurrence of such situations seems to have been long recognised as a reality in the Sāsana. The Anumāna Sutta which the venerable Moggallāna addressed to fellow members of the Order is evidently calculated to spotlight such situations and indicate ways and means of remedying them. The Sutta enumerates sixteen evil qualities which make a monk unworthy of advice from fellow members. Those which are

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

referred to as *dovacassakaraṇadhammā* include sinful thoughts, diverse expressions of violent temper, and abuse and counter attack of the critics. Besides these, they also embrace such weaknesses as jealousy, treason, fraud and deceit, and stubbornness in many ways. The presence of such evil traits would make the members of the Order distrust a fellow celibate and consider it indiscreet to offer advice and criticism even at his bidding (*Pavāreti ce'pi āvauso bhikkhu vadantu maṃ āyasmanto vacanīyo' mhi āyasmantehīti so ca hoti dubbaco dovacassakaraṇehi dhammehi samannāgato akkhamo appadakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsaniṃ. Atha kho naṃ sabrahmacāri na c'eva vattabbaṃ maññanti na ca anusāsitabbaṃ maññanti na ca tasmīṃ puggale vissāsaṃ āpajjitabbaṃ maññanti.* M.I.95). The venerable Moggallāna therefore makes a plea for the correction of these failings (*Sace āvauso bhikkhu paccavekkhamāno sabbe'p'ime pāpake akusale dhamme appahīne attani samanupassati ten'āvauso bhikkhunā sabbesaṃ y'eva imesaṃ pāpakānaṃ akusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ pahānāya vāyamiṭabbaṃ.* Ibid.).

However, inspite of everything, the need for constant guidance and correction of the disciples became increasingly imperative. Thus while the Sutta Piṭaka praised the willingness

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

of monks to accept such counsel from fellow members as a great monastic virtue and indicated how the monks should qualify themselves to be worthy of it, the Vinaya on the other hand made it almost incumbent on them to lead their monastic life under such guidance. In the early days of the Sāsana when the Buddha had only a limited number of Bhikkhus under his wing, it was found possible to regulate their lives without any enforced injunctions. The message of the Buddha was more or less personally conveyed to them. The loyalties of the early disciples to the Master were so sincere that a gentle reminder was all that was needed to regulate a disciple's conduct, for he undoubtedly knew what was expected of him. This is what is implied in the remarks which the Buddha made regarding his disciples in the Kakacūpama Sutta. The Master once addressed his disciples and said the following: `There was a time when the Bhikkhus pleased me (by their conduct) ... It was not necessary that I should lay down instructions for them. It was only a suggestion that they needed.'¹ But with the spread of Buddhism over wider territories there was a corresponding increase in the number of admissions into the Order. We know from the evidence of the Vinaya Piṭaka that latterly the Buddha did not

¹ Ibid.124

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

personally preside over such admissions.¹ Further, with these increasing numbers, there entered into the Order men of varying degrees of maturity as well as sincerity. They were not all prompted by a genuine desire to seek spiritual perfection in the monastic life. In the *Anaṅga Sutta* the venerable Mahāmoggallāna makes a complete survey of such cases.² In the interests of the *Sāsana* and the spiritual betterment of the monks themselves, they needed constant exhortation and compulsory training in discipline. The words of the venerable Sāriputta in the above *Sutta* were praised by the venerable Moggallāna as serving this purpose. Besides such counsel given from time to time, we also notice the *Khandhakas* devoting much time to the regulation and correction of the conduct of the members of the Order. As pointed out by the Buddha himself such bad conduct would not only have contradicted the lofty ideals and aspirations of the monastic life but also would have discredited the members of the Order in the eyes of the public on whose good-will they were entirely dependent for their sustenance. The *Khandhakas* refer to instances where owing to the lack of teachers and regular

¹ Vin.I.22

² M.I.32

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

instruction the members of the monastic community conducted themselves without decorum and propriety (*Tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū anupajjhāyakā anovadiyamānā ananusāsīyamānā dunnivatthā duppārutā anākappasampannā piṇḍāya caranti*. Vin.I.44, 60). The Buddha rules out such bad conduct as being reprehensible. He repeatedly pointed out that such conduct would lead to loss of favour with the public and bar the new movement which was initiated by him from winning fresh converts and stabilising itself among the old (*Ananucchaviyaṃ ananulomikaṃ appaṭṭirūpaṃ assāmaṇakaṃ akappiyaṃ akaraṇīyaṃ. N'etaṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya pasannānaṃ vā bhīyyobhāvāya..... appasannānañ c'eva appasādāya pasannānañ ca aññathattāyā'ti*. Vin.I.45).

The system of discipline which is set out in the Khandhakas attempts to remedy this situation by the appointment of two categories of teachers called Upajjhāya and Ācariya who would preside over the conduct of the members of the Saṅgha. Barring the central authority of the Buddha in his day as the founder of the organization, these two constituted the spiritual leadership of the monastic community. Referring to these, the commentarial tradition of the Samantapāsādikā defines an Upajjhāya as a teacher who could judge correctly and point out

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

to his pupils what is right and wrong (*Anupajjhāyakā'ti vajjāvajjam upanijjhāyakena garunā virahitā* - VinA.V.977). A very different role is assigned to the Ācariya in the same work. He is the teacher from whom the pupils acquire their refinement and culture (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave ācariyan'ti ācārasamācārasikkhāpanakaṃ ācariyaṃ anujānāmi* - Ibid.985). As we trace the role of the Upajjhāya and the Ācariya in the Khandhakas we see in places what approximates to a difference in their respective duties. When a pupil elects his Ācariya and invites him to fill that role, the formal invitation in terms of which he has to do it gives us some indication that the Ācariya appears to be his proximate teacher under whose immediate supervision he takes up residence. For he is made to say: 'Be thou my Ācariya. I shall live under thee.' (*Ācariyo me bhante hohi āyasmato nissāya vacchāmi* - Vin.I.60.). But under the election of an Upajjhāya we do not discover any such specification of relationship.¹ However, as the pupil reaches maturity in the Order and seniority of status (*upasampadā*) is conferred upon him he comes to owe his allegiance to the Upajjhāya. At the earliest stage in the history of the Sāsana, when the act of *upasampadā* assumed a formal character, it

¹ Vin.I.45

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

became necessary to announce in the assembly of the Saṅgha the name of the Upajjhāya under whose responsibility the Saṅgha confers seniority of status on the noviciate (*Suṇātu me bhante saṅgho. Ayaṃ itthannāmo itthannāmassa āyasmato upasampadāpekkho. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ saṅgho itthannāmaṃ upasampādeyya itthannāmena upajjhāyena. Esā ñatti.* Vin.1.56).

However, speaking of the various duties to be performed by those who preside over the discipline of the members of the Order, the Khandhakas seem to look upon both Upajjhāya and Ācariya as playing similar roles in the maintenance of monastic discipline. But there can be little doubt that each one of them carried an emphasis of his own. Both are required to be competent to develop their pupils on the following lines:

...to guide them in the discipline for the acquisition of decorum and propriety.

...to guide them in the discipline leading to the attainment of the monastic ideal.

...to regulate their life in terms of the Dhamma.

...to regulate their life in terms of the Vinaya.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

...to dispel any incorrect views they come to entertain by analysing them in terms of the Dhamma.

(Paṭibalo hoti antevāsiṃ vā saddhivihāriṃ vā abhisamācārikāya sikkhāya sikkhāpetuṃ ādibrahmacariyikāya sikkhāya vinetuṃ abhidhamme vinetuṃ abhivinaye vinetuṃ uppannaṃ diṭṭhigataṃ dhammato vivecetūṃ vivecāpetuṃ. Vin.I.64f.). The antevāsī and saddhivihārī referred to here are the pupils of the Ācariya and the Upajjhāya respectively, both of whom seem to exercise authority over the development of discipline on similar lines. The significance of abhisamācārikā sikkhā and ādibrahmacariyikā sikkhā in terms of which the Ācariya and the Upajjhāya have to train their pupils has already been discussed under sīla and sikkhā.¹ Suffice it here to say that as has been already pointed out these two forms of sikkhā are capable of exhausting between them the whole range of monastic discipline. The two terms abhidhamma and abhivinaya which are further referred to and in terms of which the pupils are to be trained by their teachers are equally comprehensive and may well echo an earlier phase of the

¹ See Chapter IV

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

Sāsana when the whole of the Buddha's teaching was reckoned in terms of Dhamma and Vinaya. Thus *abhidhamme vineti* and *abhivinaye vineti* would therefore cover the disciple's personal spiritual development as well as his monastic discipline. However, Buddhaghosa is seen narrowing the scope of the term *abhidhamma* here when he defines it as *abhidhamme ti nāmarūpaparicchede vinetuṃ na paṭibalo ti attho*.¹ This attempt of Buddhaghosa to define the term *abhidhamma* here as meaning a special branch of knowledge which is really in the field of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* is both unnecessary and unwarranted. This has already been pointed out by Oldenberg² and Miss Horner.³ But Buddhaghosa was evidently very strongly influenced by a tradition which attempted at all costs to claim for the *Abhidhamma* equal antiquity with the *Sutta* and the *Vinaya*. Finally, the teacher should safeguard his pupil against entertaining false views regarding the Dhamma and hasten to correct them whenever their presence is detected.

¹ VinA.V.990

² Vin.I.Intr. p.xii. n.2

³ *The Book of the Discipline* IV.84. n.1 See also Miss Horner's art. *Abhidhamma Abhivinaya*, IHQ.Vol.XVII.291ff.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

The importance of spiritual leadership in the rapidly expanding monastic community is further recognised in the Khandhakas as is evident from the discussions on *nissaya*.¹ At one stage the Buddha seems to have thought it fit to lay down that a pupil should live ten years under the guidance of his teacher, Ācariya or Upajjhāya.² Such a teacher must himself claim ten years standing in the Sāsana to be qualified to offer such guidance (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave dasavassāni nissāya vatthum dasavassena nissayaṃ dātum*. Vin.I.60). Subsequently it is added that the teacher who provides such guidance should not only possess his seniority of ten or more years but also be a competent and able one (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave vyattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena dasavassena vā atirekadasavassena vā nissayaṃ dātum*. op.cit.62). In course of time, under changing circumstances, it was conceded that an able and efficient pupil need spend only five years under such tutelage. However, an incompetent one may be required to spend all his life under

¹ Vin.I.60, 62, 80. Nissaya: In this context it means the dependence of the pupil on his teacher for guidance and instruction. The Vinaya prescribes a compulsory period of such tutelage for young pupil monks.

² Vin.1.60, 62

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

such conditions (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave vyattena bhikkhunā paṭbalena pañcavassāni nissāya vatthum avyattena yāvajīvaṃ*. op.cit.80). *Nissaya-paṭippassaddhi* or the withdrawal of the condition of being under the guidance of the teacher is effected only under special circumstances. Five such conditions are mentioned in the Khandhakas in relation to the Upajjhāya.¹ The dependence of a pupil on his Upajjhāya may be terminated on the latter's departure, leaving the Order, death or joining another religious group. It may also happen at the express wish of the teacher (*Pañcimā bhikkhave nissaya-paṭippassaddhiyo upajjhāyamhā. Upajjhāyo pakkanto vā hoti vibbhamanto vā kālamkato vā pakkasamkato vā āṇatti yeva pañcamī*. Vin.I.62). In the case of the Ācariya these five considerations are repeated and a sixth condition is added, which reads to the effect that whenever the Upajjhāya as the higher authority comes to supersede the Ācariya the pupil's dependence on the Ācariya is terminated: *upajjhāyena vā samodhānaṃ gato hoti*. Ibid. Here we are inclined to agree with S. Dutt in his interpretation of this point. He reads the above phrase to mean 'when the Upajjhāya and the Ācariya are together, nissaya

¹ Vin.1.62

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

towards the latter ceases.¹ The Samantapāsādikā explains it in a manner which makes it appear unnecessarily formal and mechanical.² This last consideration apparently takes note of the possible overlapping of the services of the Upajjhāya and the Ācariya in the role of *nissayadāyaka*. Certain concessions are also given with regard to life under nissaya to monks who are proceeding on a journey, are incapacitated on account of illness and to those who have chosen residence in the forest in their own interest.³

With such a vital role to play in the monastic community the Ācariya and the Upajjhāya were placed *in loco parentis* to their pupils by the Buddha. The teacher, Ācariya or Upajjhāya, should look after his pupil with paternal concern (*Ācariyo bhikkhave antevāsikamhi puttacittaṃ upaṭṭhapessati*. Vin.I.45, 60). Similarly a pupil must look upon his teacher with filial regard (*Antevāsiko ācariyamhi pitucittaṃ upaṭṭhapessati ...Evaṃ te aññaamaññaṃ sagāravā sappatissā sabhāgavuttino viharantā imasmimṃ dhammavinaye vuddhiṃ virūlhiṃ vepullaṃ āpajjissanti*. Ibid.). The Theragāthā states that such mutual

¹ S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 149f.

² VinA.V.988

³ Vin.1.92

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

respect in the monastic community is an essential step in the ladder of spiritual progress (*Yassa sabrahmacārīsu gāravo nūpalabbhati parihāyati saddhammā maccho appodake yathā*. etc. Thag.v.387f.). The teacher, thus placed in this honoured position, is expected to benefit his pupil in diverse ways of which his contribution to the pupil's spiritual progress ranks uppermost. The Khandhakas which define his proper service to the pupil go on to say that he should further the latter's progress by means of *uddesa*, *paripucchā*, *ovāda* and *anusāsanī*.¹ The Samantapāsādikā explains *uddesa* as *pālivācanā* and *paripucchā* as *pāliyā atthavaṇṇanā*, thus making it clear that it was necessary for the pupil to gain a knowledge of the teachings of the Master together with their explanation under his teacher.² It was one of the duties of the teacher to see it perfected. He was also expected to regulate the pupil's day to day life by means of *ovāda* and *anusāsanī*. Under *ovāda*, the Samantapāsādikā indicates that the teacher should forewarn his pupil regarding impropriety of behaviour (*Ovādo ti anotiṇṇe vatthusmiṃ idaṃ karohi idaṃ mā karitthā'ti vacanaṃ*.

¹ Ibid.50. These terms are translated as recitation, interrogation, exhortation and instruction respectively at BD.IV.67f.

² Vin.A.V.982

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

VinA.V.982). If the pupil happens to slip into an error the teacher should then give him further advice (*Anusāsani'ti otiṅṅe vatthusmiṃ. Ibid.*).

The pupil who thus develops his religious life under the tutelage of his Ācariya or Uajjhāya has also a part to play in safeguarding the spiritual well-being of his teachers. In the closely knitted life of the monastic community every member, both young and old, was expected to contribute his share towards mutual correction of the irreligious life and also to let himself be corrected by others. This was observed earlier under the Saṅghādisesa 12 where the following comments are made: 'May you, O sir, admonish the Bhikkhus. The Bhikkhus too, will admonish you. Thus the disciples of the Buddha are nurtured in this manner through mutual advice and correction.' (*Āyasmā'pi bhikkhu vadetu sahadhammena. Bhikkhū'pi āyasmantaṃ vakkhanti sahadhammena. Evam-samvaḍḍhā hi tassa bhagavato parisā yadidaṃ aññamaññavacanena aññamaññavuttāpanenā'ti. Vin.III.178*). Thus a pupil was expected to help his teacher in the perfection of his religious life in the following ways:¹

¹ Vin.I.49

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

If the teacher shows lack of interest in the perfection of his religious life the pupil must make every effort to dispel it.

If the teacher comes to entertain any doubt or heresy the pupil must strive to eradicate it by having recourse to religious discussions.

The pupil is further empowered to urge the Saṅgha into action against his teacher if the latter is guilty of a more serious monastic offence (*garudhamma*). As the imposition of penalties and punishments is vital in the correction of monastic indiscipline the pupil has to see that the Saṅgha carries out without fail the necessary disciplinary action on his teacher. Assisting the Saṅgha in this manner for the proper enforcement on miscreants of remedial penalties which are part of the code of the Pātimokkha was considered a great service by the pupil both to his teacher and to the monastic community.

On the otherhand, if the Saṅgha wishes to carry out on his teacher a *daṇḍakamma* or formal act, the pupil may then plead with the Saṅgha for the mitigation of sentence. He may go so far as to request the Saṅgha to waive it completely.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

However, if the punishment is meted out to the teacher the pupil must request him to conduct himself through it in a commendable manner.

This reciprocity of relations between the teacher and the pupil seems to extend to many spheres of monastic life besides the furtherance of spiritual well-being. The Khandhakas describe in great detail the services which a pupil should render to his teacher.¹ In the day to day life of the monastic community a pupil is expected to attend to the physical needs of his teacher. He shall commence his duties at daybreak by providing water and other requisites for the teacher to wash his face. He shall then prepare a seat for him and shall attend on him while he is at his meals. He shall also take good care of the teacher's possessions such as the bowl and the robe. He shall keep the teacher's place of residence in perfect order, taking good care of its belongings. In cases of illness, he shall attend on him all his life looking forward to his recovery. The teacher, in turn, has many duties which he shall fulfil towards his pupil.² He shall see that his pupil comes to possess such necessities like the bowl and the robe. Further to this, if the pupil happens

¹ Ibid.1.44f.

² Ibid.50f.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

to be indisposed, there devolves also on the teacher the additional duty of attending to all his physical needs such as were described in relation to the duties of a pupil towards his teacher.

The relationship of teacher and pupil is thus seen to be established on a basis of mutual respect and consideration. From the very inception of monastic community life such safeguards were provided in order that the machinery for its administration may not get out of control or breakdown under the strain of abuse or corruption. The first signs of the necessity to restrict the number of pupils under a single teacher appears with the incident of the two novice pupils of the venerable Upanada who abused each other.¹ In those early days of the Sāsana when the monastic community was evolving itself into shape as a respected institution we are not surprised that the first prompt action taken against the possibility of such an incident was the ban that was imposed that no teacher should keep more than one pupil (*Na bhikkhave ekena dve sāmaṇerā upaṭṭhāpetabbā. Yo upaṭṭhāpeyya āpatti dukkatassa. Vin.I.79*). The disciplinary machinery of the Vinaya was used to enforce

¹ Ibid.1.79

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

this condition as is clear from the imposition of a Dukkaṭa offence on one who fails to respect it. However, the spirit underlying this was the consideration that a teacher should have proper control over his pupils and should be able to direct their lives so as not to allow them to drift away from the path of the holy life. Consequently we find the first restriction modified soon afterwards and a teacher is allowed to have as many pupils as he could guide and instruct (... *yāvatake vā pana ussahati ovaḍiṭuṃ anusāsituṃ tāvatake upaṭṭhāpetuṃ*. Vin.I.83).

In executing the proper responsibility towards the pupils a teacher is empowered to make use of certain disciplinary measures whenever the need arises. Having specified as to what should be the proper mode of conduct of a pupil towards his teacher, the Vinaya proceeds to ensure that this order is not violated except under the pain of punishment. A teacher is given the right to turn away a pupil who does not conform to this pattern of conduct.¹ But it is also left possible for the pupil to tender an apology to his teacher and be pardoned by him for any of his transgressions. Likewise young novice monks who

¹ Vin.I.54

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

show no respect or courtesy to the senior members of the community are also liable to be subject to punishment.¹ The freedom of movement of such miscreants may be curtailed and certain restrictions may be imposed on them. At the same time it is interesting to note the extra safeguards the Vinaya provides against possible abuse of power by those who are placed in positions of trust to regulate the lives of the juniors. Several interesting examples may be cited. No teacher shall refuse to forgive his pupil whom he has turned away if he comes back to him with a sincere apology. The law shall also not be abused to turn away a really good pupil. At the same time it is also made incumbent on the teacher to turn away without discrimination every pupil who violates the accepted pattern of conduct (*asammāvattanto*). Any teacher who disregards these considerations shall be himself guilty of a Dukkaṭa offence.²

Despite all these attempts to maintain law and order in the monastic community, we discover on the evidence of the Vinaya Piṭka itself rebellious and disruptive forces at work within the Sāsana. These miscreants are generally associated with the 'band of six' or Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus. These Chabbaggiyā

¹ Ibid.84

² Ibid.54f.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

Bhikkhus and their followers attempt to wreck the machinery which is set up for the maintenance of monastic discipline. In the introduction to Pācittiya 63 we discover them challenging the validity of ecclesiastical acts which have been correctly performed by the Saṅgha.¹ At Pācittiya 76 they make false accusations against innocent Bhikkhus.² The most reprehensible example of such behaviour is the conduct of Mettiyabhummajaka Bhikkhus who falsely accuse the venerable Dabbamallaputta of a Pārājika offence.³ These miscreant monks are seen over and over again attempting to bring chaos and bitterness into the life in the monastic community.⁴ Prompted by his personal animosity against the Buddha, Devadatta too, appears to have taken a leading part in such activity. The circumstances which led to the promulgation of Saṅghādisesa 10 clearly illustrate the subtle move by Devadatta to break up the unity of the Buddhist Saṅgha.⁵ This tendency assumed dangerous proportions when such a move

¹ Vin.IV.126

² Ibid.147

³ See Saṅgh. 9: Vin.III.166f.

⁴ See Pāc.79, 80: Vin.IV.151f.

⁵ Vin.III.171f.

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

was either led by a body of people which was large enough to canvass opinion in its favour or was pioneered by one who by his power or popularity was able to influence a considerable section of the community and the public. When Devadatta stood condemned for his attempts to disrupt the unity of the Saṅgha, Kokālika attempted to convert a group in support of Devadatta.¹ This schismatic tendency is seen to have been widely prevalent even in the earliest days of the Sāsana. Under the history of the Tajjaniya-kamma it is recorded that the followers of Paṇḍukalohitaka Bhikkhus went around inciting groups of monks to fight others.² Similar behaviour on the part of Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus is seen in Pācittiya 3 where they are seen indulging in tale-bearing with a view to creating dissensions in the Saṅgha.³ On the other hand, Assajipunabbasukā Bhikkhus of Kīṭāgiri who became very popular among the people of the neighbourhood were able to mislead them completely as to what constituted the proper form of monastic behaviour. The unwarranted friendship and familiarity of these Bhikkhus had won for them such confidence with the lay people

¹ Ibid.175

² Vin.II.1f.

³ Vin.IV.12

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

that they refused to regard as acceptable even the more restrained and dignified behaviour of any other monk.¹ Thus these groups of miscreant monks were fast establishing themselves as the true representatives of the Buddhist Saṅgha. The danger of this was soon realised and the Buddha hastens to enlist the support of the leading disciples like Sāriputta and Moggallāna to eradicate such vicious elements. It is already evident that they had become considerably powerful and were even capable of physical violence. Sāriputta and Moggallāna make mention of this to the Buddha who then suggests that they should go reinforced with large numbers to deal with these miscreant monks.² In carrying out disciplinary action against them, the Buddha tells Sāriputta and Moggallāna that they are only exercising their authority as leaders in the Sāsana (*Gacchatha tumhe sāriputtā kīṭāgiriṃ gantvā assajipunabbasukānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ kīṭāgiris mā pabbājanīyakammaṃ karotha. Tumhākam ete saddhivihārino'ti.* Vin.II.14; III.182). For ever afterwards these two dynamic characters, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, served as the model of good monastic living. The Buddha himself

¹ Vin.III.181

² Vin.II.14; III.182

Chapter XII - Spiritual Leadership and Life in the Community

endorsed this view and held that every good disciple should emulate them (*Saddho bhikkhave bhikkhu evaṃ sammā āyācamāno āyāceyya tādiso homi yādisā sāriputtamoggallānā'ti. Esā bhikkhave tulā etaṃ pamāṇaṃ mama sāvakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ yadidaṃ sāriputtamoggallānā'ti. A.II.164*).

CHAPTER XIII
Women and the Religious Order of
the Buddha

At the time the Buddha set up his Order of Bhikkhus, there was in Indian society the widespread but groundless belief that woman is inferior to man. The position which the woman lost under the dominance of the Brāhmaṇas had not yet been retrieved. The Brahmins of the day evidently showed little sympathy for her sad lot. Altekar describes the position of woman in India at the time as follow: `The prohibition of *upanayana* amounted to spiritual disenfranchisement of women and produced a disastrous effect upon their general position in society. It reduced them to the status of Śūdras ... What, however, did infinite harm to women was the theory that they were ineligible for them (Vedic sacrifices) because they were of the status of the Śūdras. Henceforward they began to be bracketed with Śūdras and other backward classes in society. This we find to be the case even in the *Bhagavadgītā* (IX.32).'¹ In the *Manusmṛti* we witness the cruel infliction of domestic

¹ Altekar, A.S., *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization*, p.204-5

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

subservience on woman. The road to heaven is barred to her and there is hard bargaining with her for the offer of an alternative route. Matrimony and obedience to the husband are the only means whereby a woman can hope to reach heaven.

Nāsti strīnām pṛthag yajño na vratam nāpyupoṣatham
patim śuśrūṣate yena tena svarge mahīyate. Manu.

V.153

'Women have no sacrifices of their own to perform nor religious rites or observances to follow. Obedience to the husband alone would exalt the woman in heaven.'

This hostile attitude to woman both in religion and in society was repeatedly criticised and challenged by the Buddha on numerous occasions. In the Kosala Saṃyutta, the Buddha contradicts the belief that the birth of a daughter was not as much a cause of joy as that of a son, a belief which the ritualism of the Brāhmaṇas had contributed to strengthen. The Buddha pointed out clearly that woman had a dignified and an important part to play in society, and he defined it with great insight, fitting her harmoniously into the social fabric. She is a lovable member of the household, held in place by numerous relationships, and respected above all, as the mother of worthy

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

sons. The sex did not matter, he argued, and added that in character and in her role in society, she may even rival men.

*Itthī'pi hi ekacciyā seyyā posā janādhīpa
medhāvinī sīlavaṭī sassudevā patibbatā.
Tassā yo jāyati poso sūro hoti disampati
evaṃ subhagiyā putto rajjam'pi anusāsati.*

S.I.86

A woman child, O lord of men, may prove
Even a better offspring than a male.
For she may grow up wise and virtuous,
He husband's mother rev'rencing, true wife.
The boy that she may bear may do great deeds,
And rule great realms, yea, such a son
Of noble wife becomes his country's guide.

Kindred Sayings, I.p.111

But it is not unusual to find scholars who have missed this singular virtue of Buddhism. It would be grossly unfair to say that the Buddha did not devote much attention to the duties and ideals of laywomen or that he showed indifference to or contempt of women. Speaking of Buddhism and Jainism, Altekar unjustly says: 'Both these were ascetic religions, and they have not devoted much attention to the duties and ideals of lay women. The founders and leaders of both these

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

movements showed the indifference to, or contempt of women, which is almost universal among the advocates of the ascetic ideal.¹

The instances are numerous where the Buddha defines and describes the duties of woman in society.² Further, the Buddha recognises the fact that these do not constitute the whole of her life. It is not with a view to limiting their life solely to the secular affairs of the household that the Buddha laid down a code of good living for women, but to serve as a complement to the good life already enjoined in his religion to all his followers irrespective of their sex. A host of these considerations as they are addressed to women are grouped together in the Saṃyutta Nikāya in a chapter solely devoted to them.³ A good lay woman endowed with religious devotion, moral virtue and liberality as well as wisdom and learning, makes a success of her life in this world. For it is said:

¹ Altekar, A.S., op.cit. p.208

² A.IV.265f.

³ S.IV.328f.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

*Saddhāya sīlena ca yīdha vaḍḍhati
paṭṭāya cāgena sutena c'ūbhayaṃ
sā tādisī sīlavaṃ upāsikā
ādiyati sāraṃ idh'eva attano'ti.*
S.IV.250

'Such a virtuous lady who possesses religious devotion, cultivates virtue, is endowed with wisdom and learning and is given to charity makes a success of her life in this very existence.'

Her virtuous character gives to her life in the household poise and dignity (Pañcahi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato mātuḡāmo visārado agāraṃ ajjhāvasati. Katamehi pañcahi. Pāṇātipātā paṭivirato ca hoti ... saurāmerayamajjapamādaṭṭhānā paṭivirato ca hoti. S.IV.250). The following are also given as virtues by means of which she can make her life fruitful, both here and hereafter: Saddho (religious devotion), hirimā ottāpī (sense of shame and fear), akkodhano anupanāhī (not given to anger), anissukī (not jealous), amaccharī (not niggardly), anaticārī (chaste in behaviour), sīlavā (virtuous), bahussuto (learned), āradhaviṛiyo (zealous), upaṭṭhitassatī (mentally alert), paññavā (wise)¹. We

¹ Ibid.243-44

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

notice that all these virtues enumerated so far are within the reach of a woman living in the household. She is not rooted out of her domestic setting. The good and successful life of the laywoman, as much as of the layman, seems to have loomed large in the ethics of Buddhism. In the Aṅguttara Nikāya two sets of virtues are given whereby a woman is said to strive for success in this world as well as in the other: idhalokavijaya and paralokavijaya (Catūhi kho visākha dhammehi samannāgato mātugāmo idhalokavijayāya paṭipanno hoti ayaṃ sa loko āraddho hoti. Katamehi catūhi. Idha visākha mātugāmo susamvihitakammanto hoti saṅgahitaparijano bhattu manāpaṃ carati sambhataṃ anurakkhati ... Catūhi kho visākha dhammehi samannāgato mātugāmo paralokavijayāya paṭipanno hoti parassa loko āraddho hoti. Katamehi catūhi. Idha visākha mātugāmo saddhāsampanno hoti sīlasampanno hoti cāgasampanno hot paññāsampanno hoti. A.IV.269f.).

It is also worth noting here that the Buddha accepts the reality and significance of the institution of marriage for woman. But unlike in Hindu society, it was not the only means for the social elevation of woman. In Hinduism, a woman is supposed to become a *dvija*, a truly initiated member of the religion and

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the society, only after her marriage.¹ The virtues referred to in the Aṅguttara Nikāya² are household duties of a woman as wife which lead to domestic peace and concord. They are also calculated to keep the family administration in gear and secure for the family economic stability. This significant part which she is called upon to play is meticulously defined and it reveals neither indifference to nor contempt of women on the part of the Buddha. The good laywoman has also her duties for the development of her religious life. It is a course of graduated training which does not conflict with her household life. It is, in fact, smoothly woven into it. Religious devotion (*saddhā*), moral virtue (*sīla*), and a generous disposition (*cāga*), for instance, form part of it. This healthy combination of social and religious virtues of woman is further witnessed in the Aṅguttara Nikāya where it is said that the following eight virtues pave the way for her to proceed to heaven:

*Susaṃvīhitakammantā saṅgahitaparījjanā
bhattu manāpaṃ carati sambhataṃanurakkhati.
Saddhāsīlena sampannā vadaṭṭū vītamaccharū
niccaṃ maggaṃ visodheti sotthānaṃ samparāyikaṃ.
Iccete aṭṭhadhammā ca yassā vijjati nāriyā*

¹ Prabhu, *Hindu Social Organisation*, p.284

² A.IV.269f.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

*tam pi sīlavatīṃ āhu dhammaṭṭhaṃ saccavāḍiniṃ.
Solasākārasampannā aṭṭhaṅgasusamāgatā
tādisī sīlavatī upāsikā upapajjati devalokaṃ manāpaṃ.
A.IV.271*

They are:

1. organises the work of the household with efficiency,
2. treats her servants with concern,
3. strives to please her husband,
4. takes good care of what he earns,
5. possesses religious devotion,
6. is virtuous in conduct,
7. is kind,
8. is liberal.

The first four items of this list are identical with the first four of the five good qualities ascribed to the virtuous wife in the Sīṅgālovāda Sutta, the fifth being general efficiency (*dakkhā*) and enterprise (*analaṣā sabbakiccesu*) - D.III.p.190

It was also held in Indian belief that woman was intellectually inferior to man and therefore had no capacity to reach higher spiritual attainments. This idea clearly echoes in the Saṃyutta Nikāya where Māra, as the personification of the forces of evil,

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

strives in vain to dissuade a Bhikkhuni [Therī Somā] from her religious endeavours.

*Yaṃ taṃ isīhi pattaḃbaṃ thānaṃ durabhisambhavaṃ
na taṃ dvaṅgulaḃṭṭāya sakkā pappotuṃ itthiyā. S.I. 129*

‘No woman, with the two-finger-wisdom which is hers, could ever hope to reach those heights which are attained only by the sages.’

These words of Māra are undoubtedly resonant of the beliefs of the day and the Buddha was vehement in contradicting them. Bhikkhuni Somā to whom Māra addressed these words answered. Illustrating the Buddhist attitude to the spiritual potentialities of woman, she said:

*Itthibhāvo no kiṃ kayirā cittaṃhi susamāhite
ñāṇaṃhi vattaṃānaṃhi sammā dhammaṃ vipassato.
S.I. 129*

‘When one’s mind is well concentrated and wisdom never fails does the fact of being a woman make any difference?’

However, there is evidence that this age-old scepticism about the spiritual potentialities of woman died hard. Even in

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the face of success achieved by Bhikkhunis in Buddhism, a groundless belief seems to have prevailed which distrusted the capacity of woman for spiritual perfection. On the eve of her final passing away, when Mahāpajāpati Gotami visits the Buddha to bid him farewell, he calls upon her to give proof of the religious attainments of the Bhikkhunis in order to convince the disbelieving sceptics.

*Thīnaṃ dhammābhisamaye ye bālā vimaṭṭhaṃ gatā
tesaṃ diṭṭhipahānatthaṃ iddhiṃ dassahi gotami.*

Ap.II.535

'O Gotami, perform a miracle in order to dispel the wrong views of those foolish men who are in doubt with regard to the spiritual potentialities of woman.'

Buddhism, with its characteristic note of realism, also recognises the inherent qualities of woman which make her attractive to the opposite sex. Nothing else in the world, it is said, can delight and cheer a man so much as a woman. In her, one would find all the fivefold pleasures of the senses. The world of pleasure exists in her.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

*Pañcakāmaguṇā ete itthirūpasmiṃ dissare
rūpā saddā rasā gandhā phoṭṭhabbā ca manoramā.*

A.III.69

'All these five-fold pleasures of the senses which gratify the mind are centered in the feminine form.'

The power which the woman derives through this may, at the same time, extend so far as to make man throw all reason to the winds and be a pawn in her hand, under the influence of her charm. Thus, it is even possible that a mother may err in relation to her son or vice versa: *Kin nu so bhikkhave moghapuriso maññati na mātā putte sārājati pūtto vā pana mātarīti.*¹ The Aṅguttara is equally emphatic when it says: *Nāhaṃ bhikkhave aññaṃ ekarūpaṃ'pi samanupassāmi evaṃ rajanīyaṃ evaṃ kamanīyaṃ evaṃ madanīyaṃ evaṃ bandhanīyaṃ evaṃ mucchanīyaṃ evaṃ antarāyakaraṃ anuttarassa yogakkhemassa adhigamāya yatha y'idaṃ bhikkhave itthirūpaṃ. Itthirūpe bhikkhave sattā rattā giddhā*

¹ i.e., 'What, O monks, does that foolish man think that a mother would not feel lustfully attached to her son or the son to his mother.' See *Gradual Sayings*, III.p.55 for a different translation of this passage which we consider to be incorrect.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

gadhitā mucchitā ajjhoppānā te dīgharattam socanti itthirūpavasānugā... A.III.68. Therefore a man might say without exaggeration that woman is a trap laid out on all sides by Māra (*yaṃ hi taṃ bhikkhave sammā vadamāno vadeyya samantapāsā'ti mātugāmaṃ y'eva sammā vadamāno vadeyya samantapāso mārassā'ti.* A.III.68). These observations are made, however, not as a stricture on their character but as a warning to the men, who in seeking their company, might err on the side of excess. It is true that at times they tend to be overstressed, but obviously with no malice to women. There is pointed reference to the unguarded nature of the man who falls a prey to these feminine charms.

*Muṭṭhassatiṃ tā bandhanti pekkhitena mhitena ca
atho'pi dunnivatthena mañjunā bhaṇitena ca
n'eso jano svāsaddo api ugghātito mato.*

A.III.69

*'Women ensnare a man of heedless mind with their
glances and smiles or with artful grooming (dunnivattha)
and pleasing words. Women are such that one cannot*

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

approach them in safety even though they may be stricken and dead."

Thus it becomes clear that it is not in the spirit of Buddhism to brand woman as a source of corruption for man. Note the words 'a man of heedless mind' in the above quotation. It would be interesting to contrast here the words of Manu who says: 'It is the nature of woman to seduce men in this world' (*Svabhāva eva nārīṇāṃ narāṇāṃ iha dūṣanaṃ* - Manu.II.213). The Jains too, inspite of their admission of women into their Monastic Order, do not seem to have differed very much from the Brahmins in their attitude towards women. The Ācāraṅga Sūtra, in the course of a religious admonition known as the Pillow of Righteousness, makes the following comment which stigmatises woman completely: 'He to whom women were known as the causes of all sinful acts, he saw (the true state of the world).'² The position of woman in Jainism is summed up as follows: "Right in the earliest portions of the Canon woman is looked upon as something evil that enticed innocent males into a snare of misery. They are described as 'the greatest

¹ See *Gradual Sayings*, III.p.57

² *Jaina Sūtras* I [SBE.XXII], p.81

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

temptation', 'the causes of all sinful acts', 'the slough', 'demons' etc. Their bad qualities are described in exaggerated terms. Their passions are said to destroy the celibacy of monks 'like a pot filled with lac near fire.'" ¹

In Buddhism, on the other hand, the caution which men are called upon to exercise in their dealings with the opposite sex springs solely from the Buddhist attitude to *kāma* or the pleasures of the senses. *Kāmā* are described in Buddhism as leading to grief and turbulence. *Kāmā* thwart the path to transcendental happiness. This attitude is eloquently manifest in the counsel given to Ariṭṭha in the Alagaddūpama Sutta.²

Of this vast field of sense experience, sex is only a segment but it is admittedly one with irresistible appeal and thus required a special word of warning, particularly to those who are keen on the pursuit of mental equipoise. The Buddha says that if it were left unbridled, it would, in expressing itself, shatter all bounds of propriety (*Kin nu so bhikkhave moghapuriso maññati na mātā putte sārājati putto vā pana matarīti*. A.III.68). Hence the desire to lead a chaste and moral life, eschewing, even completely,

¹ Deo, S.B., *History of Jaina Monachism*, p.493. See *supra* p.38

² M.I.130

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the gratification of sex desires, can as much be the aspiration of a woman as of a man. Besides this philosophic attitude to the pleasures of the world in which the woman admittedly plays a dominant part, there seems to be nothing in Buddhism which looks upon sex or woman as being corrupt in themselves.

Thus it becomes clear that the philosophy of early Buddhism had no reservations whatsoever regarding the spiritual emancipation of woman. In the ocean of *saṃsāra* her chances swimming across to the further shore were as good as those of man. Emancipation of the mind through perfection of wisdom which is referred to as *cetovimutti paññāvimutti* was the goal of religious life and for this the way which had proved most effective was the life of renunciation. The woman was as much encumbered by household life as man and in her spiritual earnestness she would have equally well echoed the words of the man who chooses renunciation. She would say with him that the household life is full of impediments and contrast it with the life of *pabbajjā* (*Sambādho gharāvāso rajopatho abbhokāso pabbajjā*. M.I.179).

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

But according to the evidence of the Pali texts,¹ the admission of women into the life of *pabbajjā* in Buddhism does not seem to have been effected with as much ease as one would expect. According to these, the Buddha appears to have shown some reluctance to admit women into the Order. When Mahāpajāpati Gotami requested the Buddha to consent to the entry of women into his Order he is said to have put her off three times, saying: 'Do not be interested O, Gotami, about the entry of women into my Order.'² This does seem to imply that the presence of women in the monastic institution of brahmacariya was considered, for some reason or other, to be detrimental to its well-being. In an atmosphere where women were considered a danger to spiritual life, their presence in the inner circle of religious life as members of the monastic community would have naturally called for serious comment. However, there is evidence that Jainism had already broken through this barrier against women. But the vicissitudes of the Jaina monastic community, in the relations between the two orders of monks and nuns, as well as of nuns and laymen,

¹ A.IV.274; Vin.II.253

² Ibid. The other schools of Buddhism too, besides the Theravādins, do not appear to have challenged the historicity of this incident.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

could not apparently have been very heartening to the Buddha. Speaking of the reforms introduced by Mahāvīra with the addition of the fifth vow of chastity to the earlier *cauyāma samvara* of Pārśva, Jacobi says, 'The argumentation in the text presupposes a decay of morals of the monastic order to have occurred between Pārśva and Mahāvīra ...'.¹ There is also evidence from another quarter of the promiscuity in the behaviour of male and female mendicants in the Buddha's day. The Buddha takes note of this in the Culladhammasamādāna Sutta where he speaks of Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas who repudiating the view that sensual pleasures are detrimental to spiritual progress, mingle freely with female mendicants, vociferously enjoying their company. They are reported as saying -

'Whatever can be the basis for pleading for the renunciation of sensual pleasures? What future calamity can lie in wait for us? Blissful indeed is the contact of the soft and tender hands of these young female mendicants.'²

¹ *Jaina Sūtras* II. [SBE.XLV], 122.n.3

² M.I.305

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

However, the Buddha concedes to Ānanda that women, having taken to the life of *pabbajjā* in Buddhism, are capable of attaining the higher fruits of religious life as far as Arahantship (*Bhabbo Ānanda mātugāmo tathāgatappavedīte dhammavinaye agāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajitvā sotāpattiṃ phalam'pi sakadāgāmiṃ phalam'pi anāgāmiṃ phalam'pi arahattaphalam'pi sacchikātuṃ'ti*. A.IV.276; Vin.II.254). The considerations which seem to have weighed heavy in the mind of the Buddha regarding the admission of women into the Order are concerned more with the wider problem of the monastic organization as a whole. He would have been undoubtedly most averse to stand in the way of the personal liberty of woman. But in the interests of the collective good of the institution of brahmacariya, which was the core of the religion, women had to make certain sacrifices, surrendering at times even what might appear to have been their legitimate rights, This is evident from the eight conditions (*aṭṭha-garudhammā*) under which the Buddha granted them permission to enter the Order.

1. A nun who has been ordained (even) for a century must greet respectfully, rise up from her seat, salute with

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

joined palms, do proper homage to a monk ordained but that day.

2. A nun must not spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk. (See Bhikkhunī Pāc.56: Vin.IV.313).
3. Every half-month a nun should desire two things from the Order of monks: the asking (as to the date) of the Observance day, and the coming for the exhortation. (See Bhikkhunī Pāc.59: Ibid.315)
4. After the rains a nun must 'invite' before both Orders in respect of three matters: what was seen, what was heard, what was suspected. (See Bhikkhunī Pāc.57: Ibid.314)
5. A nun, offending against an important rule, must undergo Mānatta (discipline) for half a month before both Orders.
6. When, as a probationer, she has trained in the six rules [*chasu dhammesu*. **Note that the reference, in our opinion, is not to *sikkhāpada***] for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders.
7. A monk must not be abused or reviled in any way by a nun.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

8. From today admonition of monks by nuns is forbidden, admonition of nuns by monks is not forbidden.

Book of the Discipline.V.354-55

The insistence on these *aṭṭha-garudhammā* is the most vital issue, much more than the delayed consent of the Buddha, in the founding of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana. The delay, it may in fact be argued, would have proved useful to emphasise the conditions which he was going to lay down. It is these conditions alone which gave the women access to the monastic life in Buddhism (*Sace ānanda mahāpajāpati gotamī aṭṭhagarudhamme paṭigaṇhāti sāvā 'ssā hotu upasampadā. Vin.II.255*). The Dharmagupta Vinaya in the Chinese version compares them to a bridge over a great river by means of which one is enabled to cross over to the further bank.¹ These *garudhammā* are observances which pertain to monastic propriety and procedure in the Order of Bhikkhunis in relation to the Bhikkhus. The women are not to violate these as long as they remain in the monastic community. In the establishment of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana, these conditions seem to have engaged greater attention than even the formulation of the code of moral

¹ *Taisho* Vol.22.p.923 B

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

precepts, which incidentally is not even mentioned at this stage. There is no doubt that in maintaining the vigour and vitality of the Saṅgha, whether of the Bhikkhus or of the Bhikkhunis, the code of the Pātimokkha played a vital part. But it seems to be equally true to say that in bringing the newly inaugurated Bhikkhunī Saṅgha in to a healthy relationship with the older institution of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, the *aṭṭha garudhammā* were calculated to play a greater role. They take no note of moral considerations. A perfect functioning of the latter, in the case of the Bhikkhunis too, was apparently taken for granted at this early stage of their Sāsana. That a similar state of affairs did exist even in the Bhikkhu Saṅgha in its early history is evident in the Kakacūpama Sutta.¹

On a closer examination of the *aṭṭha garudhammā* we are led to make the following observations. According to these the Bhikkhu Saṅgha is looked upon as the more mature and responsible body, evidently on account of its seniority, which is capable of leading the way for the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. This is clearly evident from the *garudhammā* 2 and 3.² The Bhikkhunis are expected to recognise the spiritual leadership of the Order

¹ M.I.124

² Vin.II.255

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

of Bhikkhus. At least at the outset, the Bhikkhunis had to seek the assistance of the Bhikkhus in such vital monastic rituals like the *pātimokkhuddesa* and *bhikkhunovāda*. But it is evident that, as circumstances recesitated and experience proved opportune, the Buddha did transfer some of these powers to the Bhikkhunis themselves.¹ However, the recognition of the leadership of the monks over the community of nuns and this position of the Bhikkhus *in loco parentis* to the Bhikkhunis seem to have continued much longer. Even when the authority to recite the Pātimokkha by themselves was finally transferred to the Bhikkhunis, the Bhikkhus were still left with the right to instruct them on its proper performance (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ ācikkhitum evaṃ pātimokkham uddiseyyāthā'ti*. Vin.II.259). There is also evidence of a similar reservation of power in the transference of authority to the Bhikkhunis to impose penalties and punishments on their fellow members. The Bhikkhus who carried out these acts at the outset are latterly barred from doing so and are authorised only to explain to the Bhikkhunis the proper procedure. (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnam ācikkhitum evaṃ kammaṃ kareyyāthā'ti*. Vin.II.260).

¹ Ibid.259

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

In the matter of *bhikkhunovāda* too, it was a Bhikkhu who was appointed to remind the Bhikkhunis regularly of the proper observance of the *aṭṭha garudhammā*.¹ Thus on account of this complete dependence of a Bhikkhuni on the leadership of a Bhikkhu, the second of these eight *garudhammā* forbade the Bhikkhunis from going into residence for the rains-retreat in a place where there were no Bhikkhus. The third *garudhamma* too, implies the reliance of the Bhikkhunis on the Order of Bhikkhus in the performance of the two functions of *uposathapucchaka* and *ovādūpasanikamana*. Both the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis seem to have been vigilant about the proper observance of these functions which they considered, no doubt, to be vital for the healthy progress of the newly established Order of nuns. (i. *Bhikkhuniyo tā bhikkhuniyo etadavocuṃ kattha ayyāyo vassaṃ vutthā kacci ovādo iddho ahoṣīti. N'atthi ayye tattha bhikkhū. Kuto ovādo iddho bhavissatīti. Yā tā bhikkhuniyo appicchā...vipācenti kathaṃ hi nāma bhikkhuniyo abhikkhuke āvāse vassaṃ vasissantīti. Vin.IV.313.* ii. *Tena kho pana samayena bhikkhuniyo uposatham'pi na pucchanti ovādam'pi na yācanti. Bhikkhuū ujjhāyanti khīyanti vipācenti kathaṃ hi nāma bhikkhuniyo uposathaṃ... na yācissantīti.*

¹ Vin.IV.51f.

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

Ibid.315). At the first sign of slackness with regard to these there is a storm of protests and we notice that the authorities take immediate action to remedy it. These considerations are brought within the legal framework of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana and the failure to observe these come to be declared punishable offences.¹ In other words they become part of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. In the study of the *sikkhāpada* of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha we have already noted this interesting phenomenon of the change over into legal statutes of what was once observed as honoured conventions.

The *garudhamma* 4, 5 and 6 concern themselves with some of the other major items of administration in the Buddhist monastic community, viz. i. the performance of the *pavāraṇā* at the end of the rains-retreat, ii. the imposition of necessary penalties on the commission of a grave offence, and iii. the conferment of *upasampadā* or higher monastic status. As far as the Bhikkhunis are concerned, they are barred under these *garudhammā* from performing any of these acts within their own Order of the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. These acts of the Bhikkhunis are not considered valid unless they are carried out jointly

¹ Ibid.313, 315. See Bhikkhunī Pācittiya 56, 59

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

together with the monks. However, practical considerations soon necessitated amendments to these and we see in the revised version of these conditions the sanction given to the Bhikkhunis to perform these acts, in the first instance, by themselves. Then they are expected to bring their decisions before the Bhikkhu Saṅgha for ratification. The following is the amended procedure for the conferment of *upasampadā* on a Bhikkhuni by the Bhikkhu Saṅgha: *anujānāmi bhikkhave ekato upasampannāya bhikkhunīsaṅghe visuddhāya bhikkhusaṅghe upasampadan'ti*. Vin.II.271, 274. It shows that the candidate had been already approved by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. The Bhikkhunis were also allowed to perform their *pavāraṇā* in two stages before the two assemblies, first among themselves and then before the Bhikkhu Saṅgha (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave ajjatanā pavāretvā aparajju bhikkhusaṅghe pavāretun'ti*. Ibid.275).

Thus, from the manner in which the Buddha directed the activities of the Bhikkhunis it becomes clear that he did realise that as the Bhikkhunis formed a part of the single body of the Saṅgha, their decisions would affect not only themselves, but also the rest of that vast organization. Hence the Bhikkhus were given the right to advise and assist the Bhikkhunis in their affairs, and thus regulate the destinies of the Sāsana. Public

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

opinion must have played a considerable part in bringing Bhikkhunis under the wing of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha. At any rate, it appears to have been considered wise to have all the important monastic activities of the Bhikkhunis linked up with the more established and senior group of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha. However, when and wherever this advisory role had to be transferred from the collective organization of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha to a single individual, the Buddha took every necessary precaution to avoid possible abuse of privilege. He has laid down a very comprehensive list of eight requirements which should be satisfied before a monk could be selected to the role of a *bhikkhunovādaka* to give counsel to the congregation of nuns. There seems to be little doubt about his anxiety and his foresight regarding the safety and well-being of the female members of his Order. A monk who is entrusted to preside over their welfare should conform to perfect standards of moral virtue. He should also possess a thorough knowledge of the teaching of the Master and know well the complete code of the Pātimokkha covering both the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis. He should be of pleasant disposition, mature in years and

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

acceptable to the Bhikkhunis, and above all, should in no way have been involved in a serious offence with a Bhikkhuni.¹

The three remaining *garudhammā* 1, 7 and 8, appear to have baffled some students of Buddhism as being contrary to the Buddha's general attitude to women. However, if these are examined carefully in their context, this apparent contradiction becomes less glaring. They all strive to see that the Bhikkhunis do not, under any circumstance, assert their superiority over the Bhikkhus. We notice that even in the observance of *sikkhāpada*, the Bhikkhunis are to follow the lead of the Bhikkhus wherever the *sikkhāpada* are common to both groups. The Buddha advises the Bhikkhunis to follow the Bhikkhus in the practice of such *sikkhāpada* (... *yathā bhikkhū sikkhanti tathā tesu sikkhāpadesu sikkhathā'ti*. Vin.II.258). But referring to the *sikkhāpada* which are peculiar to the Bhikkhunis, he suggests that they should be followed, as they are laid down, according to the letter of the law(... *yathā-paññattesu sikkhāpadesu sikkhathā'ti*. Ibid.258). What seems to follow from these words of instruction to the Bhikkhunis is that even if there was a difference between the text of the *sikkhāpada* laid down

¹ Vin.IV.51

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

for the Bhikkhus and their practice at the time, the Buddha did not think it wise, for purposes of communal harmony, to leave room for the Bhikkhunis to be critical of this discrepancy. Such a challenge would have completely undermined the prestige and the authority of the older institution of the Saṅgha, quite out of proportion to any degree of moral good it could bring about by the correction of Bhikkhus by the Bhikkhunis.

There is evidence to show that the Buddha was always concerned with the esteem in which the public held his monastic organization. Such a consideration was vital for its existence and prosperity. The first remarks which he made to his erring disciples as he criticised their conduct always pertains to this (*N' etaṃ moghapurisa appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya pasannānaṃ vā bhīyyobhāvāya*. Vin.I.58; II.2; III.21, 45). As much as the Buddha wanted his disciples to correct their mistakes and be of faultless conduct, he did not want any of them to divulge to any one other than a Bhikkhu or a Bhikkhuni the more serious offences of their fellow members. Such an intimation was allowed only with the approval of the Bhikkhus (*Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhussa duṭṭhullaṃ āpattiṃ anupasampannassa āroceyya aññatra bhikkhusammutiyā pācittiyaṃ*. Vin.IV.31). One who violates this injunction is guilty

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

of a Pācittiya offence (Pāc.9). This provision was undoubtedly made with the best of intentions and should not be misjudged as contributing in any way to the perpetuation of monastic offences. On the other hand, it is in fact repeatedly declared that it is irregular for a monk to conceal intentionally an offence of one member from the rest of the community. Pācittiya 64 of the monks and Pārājika 2 and Saṅghādisesa 9 of the nuns are all calculated to avoid such a possibility.¹ All these precautions, therefore, seem to be a part of a system of internal security set up by the Buddha in the interests of the monastic organization. They emphasise the Buddha's concern both for the public esteem and for the moral soundness of his Order.

There seems to be a general agreement about the fact that the eight *garudhammā* were laid down by the Buddha as a condition governing the establishment of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana. However, strange as it may seem, after the Bhikkhunī Sāsana was instituted under the leadership of Gotami, she appears before Ānanda to make the request that the Buddha should remove the first *garudhamma* and allow Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis to pay courtesies to each other according to

¹ Vin.IV.127, 216, 239

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

seniority alone.¹ This could hardly be true to the spirit in which Gotami accepted the *garudhammā*.² We are inclined to think that she was here undoubtedly subjected to undue pressure of her own group.

This dissentient note which we find recorded in the Cullavagga, it is important to note, does not seem to have found general acceptance elsewhere. Of the Chinese Vinaya texts we have examined, it is only the Mahīśāsakas who record it and that too with a different emphasis.³ According to their text Gotami, prior to her being ordained, sends Ānanda to the Buddha to request him to make this change. The Buddha refuses to do so and says that since he has now allowed women to enter the Order they should follow what has been laid down and not go against it. In the Cullavagga too, the Buddha declines to make this concession. But in trying to give a reason for this attitude of the Buddha, the Theriya tradition attempts to make out that in the organization of the Sāsana social considerations, as much as moral and ethical values, loomed large in the mind of the Master. In the Cullavagga he is reported

¹ Ibid.II.257-58

² Op.cit.255-56.

³ *Taisho*, Vol.22. p.186. A

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

as saying: 'Not even the Tittiyas who propound imperfect doctrines sanction such homage of men towards women. How could the Tathāgata do so?'¹

We should also here consider the fact that any concession for the abrogation of what had already been laid down after careful deliberation would be grossly contradictory to the ideal which the Buddha and his early disciples appear to have upheld regarding the observance of the rules and regulations laid down for the guidance of monastic life. ⁶ The reply which the Buddha seems to have given to Gotami in the Chinese version of the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya is definitely more in keeping with this spirit. But we should take note of the fact that this reply would run contrary to the Theriya tradition, which at some stage, seems to have accommodated the idea that the Buddha conceded the abrogation of the minor rules.²

As far as we are aware there is one other Vinaya tradition which records a challenge of the *garudhammā*. The Chinese version of the Dharmagupta Vinaya has a chapter entitled 'Bhikkhunī Khandhaka' wherein the question is asked whether

¹ Vin.II.258

² D.II.14; Vin.II.287. See Appendix. II

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the Bhikkhunis cannot accuse the Bhikkhus under any circumstances.¹ The Buddha replies to say that they could not do so even if the Bhikkhus violated the rules of discipline or were guilty of offences. These two protests on the part of the Bhikkhunis seem to show that the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, or at least a section of it, resisted what it considered to be harsh legislation.

At the same time one has to view dispassionately the position of the Buddha, who as the head of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha which was already a well-groomed institution, had to safeguard against its disintegration through dispute and discontent. The fifth accusation levelled against Ānanda at the First Council, that he agitated for the admission of women into the Order², is a clear indication that even after the recognised success of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana³ there was a section of the Bhikkhus who formed as it were a consolidated opposition against it. The motive for such an attitude could have been generated by the fear of being eclipsed by the newer Order. The Chinese version

¹ *Taisho*, Vol.22.p.927 A

² Vin.II.289

³ Note the Buddha's remarks to Pajāpati Gotami before her passing away at Apadāna II.535.v.79

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

of the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya includes a statement which is ascribed to the Buddha which seems to lend support to this assumption. The Buddha says that if there were no Bhikkhunis in the Sāsana, then after his death the male and female lay-devotees (*upāsakā* and *upāsikā*) would have honoured the Bhikkhus in diverse ways. But now that the Bhikkhunis had entered the Order it would not happen so.¹ It is difficult here to decide how and why the presence of Bhikkhunis in the Sāsana should have brought about such a radical change in the attitude of laymen and lay-women towards the Bhikkhus. Why were the Bhikkhus deprived of the honour that would have been theirs had not the Bhikkhunis appeared on the scene? Are the Bhikkhunis to be held responsible for the loss of prestige of the Bhikkhus? At any rate, this record of the Mahīśāsakas was undoubtedly representative of a section of the opinion of the day regarding the Bhikkhunī Sāsana.

The Pali records of the Theriya tradition which belong to an earlier phase of the history of the Sāsana² give expression to a similar feeling in the chastisement of Ānanda in whom ultimately lay the responsibility for the admission of women into

¹ *Taisho*, Vol.22. p.186. B

² Vin.II.p.289. See also *Ibid.*256

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the Order. An echo of this is felt in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya where Ānanda apologises to the Buddha for having requested him to permit women to enter the Order. But the Buddha absolves him saying that he did so unwittingly under the influence of Māra.¹ The Theriya tradition is not alone again in expressing the fact that the presence of women in the Sāsana would reduce its life span by half. We find it recorded in the Chinese version of the Dharmagupta Vinaya that the Buddha told Ānanda that if women did not enter the Order it would have lasted 500 years longer.²

It becomes clear from what has been said so far that at the time of crystalization of Theriya traditions two ideas regarding the establishment of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana stood out clearly. A section of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha was reproachful of Ānanda because he interceded with the Buddha for the sake of the Bhikkhunis. The admission of women was also considered a categorical danger to the successful continuance of the Sāsana. In the light of all this evidence a study of the *garudhammā* reveals to us the fact that the Buddha was keenly conscious of the need to steer clear of the possible rivalries of

¹ *Taisho*, Vol.22. p.186 A

² *Ibid.*p.923 C. See also Vin.II.256

Chapter XIII - Women and the Religious Order of the Buddha

the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis and maintain healthy and harmonious relations between the two groups.

CHAPTER XIV

The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis

In spite of the numerous comments and criticisms which are associated with the founding of the Order of Bhikkhunis it is clearly evident that it soon became a recognised component of the religious organization of the Buddha.

*Bhikkhu ca sīlasampanno bhikkhunī ca bahussutā
upāsako ca yo saddho yā ca saddhā upāsikā
ete kho saṅghaṃ sobhenti ete hi saṅghasobharā.*

A.II. 8

Virtuous monks and learned nuns,
Laymen and laywomen of great devotion.
These indeed are an ornament to the Saṅgha.
They do indeed adorn the Saṅgha.

The *catuparisā* or the fourfold assembly, which included both Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis together with laymen and laywomen, was the dynamic institution of Buddhism which gave the religion its vitality and its validity. In the Pāsādika Sutta the Buddha tells Cunda how the stability of the religion depends on the

achievements of this fourfold assembly which includes both Bhikkhunis and laywomen, showing that women were by no means an appendix but an integral part of the corpus of the religion (*Santi kho pana me cunda etarahi therā bhikkhū sāvakā vyattā vinītā visāradā ... therā bhikkhuniyo sāvikā ... upāsakā sāvakā ... upāsikā sāvikā ... Etarahi kho pana me cunda brahmacariyaṃ iddhañ ca phītañ ca vitthārikaṃ bāhujaññaṃ puthubhūtaṃ yāva'd'eva manussehi suppakāsitaṃ*. D.III.125f.). This significance of the Bhikkhunī Sāsana is further attested in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, where heedless of an anachronism, it is said that the Buddha, not long after his enlightenment, told Māra that he would not pass away into *parinibbāna* until his fourfold assembly, including the Bhikkhunis, i.e. Bhikkhu, Bhikkhunī, Upāsaka and Upāsikā, is well and firmly established (*Na tāvā'ham pāpima parinibbāyissāmī yāva me ... bhikkhuniyo na sāvikā bhavissanti viyattā vinītā visāradā... sappāṭihāriyaṃ dhammaṃ desessanti*. D.II.113). The presence of women in the monastic life is accepted as a reality and most admonitions which were addressed to the Bhikkhus were equally applicable to the Bhikkhunis as well (*Yassa kassaci bhikkhave bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā kāyavaṅko appahīno kāyadoso kāyakasāvo vacīvaṅko ... manovaṅko ... evampapatitā te bhikkhave imasmā dhammavinayā seyyathā'pi taṃ cakkaṃ chahi divasehi*

Chapter XIV - The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis

niṭṭhitam. A.I.112f.). However, there soon evolved a separate code of conduct for the use of the Bhikkhunis which took into consideration the differences not only of sex but also of temperament between the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis.

In the study of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha we have already observed how both the text and the ritual of the Pātimokkha grew out of the restrictive regulations which the Buddha had to lay down from time to time to discipline the monks who were leading the life of brahmacariya under him (*Yannūnā'haṃ yāni mayā bhikkhūnaṃ paññattāni sikkhāpadāni tāni nesam pātimokkhuddesaṃ anujāneyyaṃ*. Vin.I.102). As this first collection of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha grew, associated for the most part with monks alone, some of its rules no doubt came to possess a peculiarly masculine relevance. Nevertheless, the Pātimokkha as a code meant to further the life of brahmacariya would have applied in its essence to the women as well when they sought admission to be ordained as Bhikkhunis under the Buddha. Recognising the character of woman from diverse angles, both social and religious, the Buddha had to make relevant changes in the Pātimokkha of the Bhikkhus to make it acceptable to the Order of the Bhikkhunis. Yet it remained essentially the same, the guide to the monastic life of those men and women who renounced the world.

The evolution of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha out of the Pātimokkha which was laid down for the Bhikkhus seems to have confused some scholars considerably with regard to its size and contents.¹ We shall therefore first examine this phenomenon. The regulation of the discipline of the newly established Bhikkhunī Sāsana does not seem to have necessitated any structural alteration of the original Pātimokkha. The original classification of *sikkhāpada* into different categories is accepted in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, almost *in toto*, the group of Aniyatas of the Bhikkhu Pātikokkha being the only one to be left out in the latter. On a closer examination, however, it would be discovered that these two Aniyata dhammas are themselves a further development out of the Bhikkhu Pācittiyas 44 and 45 which have been made applicable to the Bhikkhunis as well. On the other hand a number of individual rules which are peculiar to the male members alone had to be left out while a host of new rules came to be added to cover the special needs of the women in the monastic community.

¹ Miss D.N. Bhagavat, *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, p.164ff.

Pārājika

The four Pārājikā of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha are increased to eight in the code of the Bhikkhunis. Nos. 1, 2, and 4 of these additional rules¹ which are peculiar to the Bhikkhunis (*asādhāraṇa paññatti*) pertain to sex life in some way or another and can therefore be looked upon as secondary rules deriving from Pārājika 1 of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha. However, in the life of the Bhikkhunis, they are considered serious enough to be ranked under Pārājika. Thus half the number of Pārājika rules laid down for the Bhikkhunis deal with sex. These *sikkhāpada* not only attempt to safeguard the chastity of the *brahmacārinī* but also try to keep the whole body of Bhikkhunis above reproach. Unchaste behaviour of female mendicants was a reality in contemporary society² and seeing the possibility of similar incidents within his own monastic Order, the Buddha was prompted to provide these extra safeguards. There is

¹ The numbering of the additional rules of the Bhikkhunis here is in accordance with the abridged text of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin.IV.211-251) where only the *asādhāraṇa paññatti* are listed. Hence these numbers do not indicate the real position of the *sikkhāpada* in relation to the complete text of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha.

² M.I.305

evidence of incidents in the history of the Sāsana in which Bhikkhunis were involved which were serious enough for public censure. The Mahāvagga records the incident of the *sāmaṇera* Kaṇḍaka who violated the chastity of a Bhikkhuni (*Tena kho pana samayena āyasmato upanandassa sakyaputtassa kaṇḍako nāma sāmaṇero kaṇḍakaṃ nāma bhikkhuniṃ dūsesi*. Vin.I.58). Provoked perhaps by the recurrence of such events the public also did at times make hasty and groundless accusations implicating Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis. A widowed father who had taken to the monastic life along with his young son once became the target of such an accusation. The father was accused, as a Bhikkhu, of having had the child through a Bhikkhuni (*Abrahmacārino ime samaṇā sakyaputtiyā. Ayaṃ dārako bhikkhuniyā jāto'ti*. Vin.I.79).

The Bhikkhunis were forbidden to indulge in frivolous behaviour with members of the opposite sex. A number of rules of the Bhikkhunis which supplement the contents of the Saṅghādisesa and Pācittiya groups of the Bhikkhus regulate the conduct of the Bhikkhunis with adequate caution so that they may not fall victims to the lustful desires of unscrupulous men. The following rules of the Bhikkhunis deserve special mention here: Saṅghādisesas 3, 5 and 6 and Pācittiyas 11-14, 36.

Chapter XIV - The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis

Saṅghādisesa 3: No Bhikkhuni shall, alone, leave the village, cross the river and go beyond, shall stay a night out, or be out of the company of the group. Whoever does so shall be guilty of a Saṅghādisesa offence. Vin.IV.229

Saṅghādesesa 5: No Bhikkhuni shall, with lustful intentions, receive and partake of any food from a lustful man with similar intentions. Ibid.233

Saṅghādisesa 6: No Bhikkhuni shall tell another 'what ever will this man do unto you, whether he is lustful or otherwise as long as you entertain no such thoughts. Therefore accept and partake of whatever he offers you.' Ibid.234

Pācittiya 11: No Bhikkhuni shall, in the darkness of the night, at a place where there is no lamp, stay alone in the company of a man or converse with him. Whoever does so shall be guilty of a Pācittiya offence. Ibid.268.

Pācittiya 12: No Bhikkhuni shall stay alone in the company of a man or converse with him in a secluded place. Ibid.269.

Pācittiya 13: No Bhikkhuni shall stay alone in the company of a man or converse with him in an open place. Ibid.270.

Pācittiya 14: No Bhikkhuni shall, in the street, in a blind alley or at the cross-roads, stay alone in the company of a man,

converse with him, whisper in his ear or send away the Bhikkhuni who is her only companion. Ibid.271.

Pācittiya 36: No Bhikkhuni shall live in close association with a house-holder or a house-holder's son ... Ibid.294.

The other additional rule (No.3) in the Pārājika group of the Bhikkhunis makes it an offence for a Bhikkhuni to follow a monk who had been lawfully subjected to a boycott by the Saṅgha (*ukkhittānuvattikā*).¹ Such indiscreet partisan loyalties, whether on the part of the Bhikkhus or of the Bhikkhunis, would have made it difficult to maintain law and order and to ensure harmony within the monastic community. Pācittiya 69 of the Bhikkhus warns monks against associating a miscreant Bhikkhu who had been lawfully subjected to punishment. According to the history of this *sikkhāpada* an act of boycott had been carried out by the Saṅgha on a monk named Ariṭṭha who held fast to a heresy, and the rest of the community were barred from seeking his company under the pain of a Pācittiya offence.² In the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, the loyalties of Bhikkhuni Thullanandā towards the same miscreant Bhikkhu Ariṭṭha assumes major proportions and leads to the promulgation of a Pārājika

¹ Vin.IV.218

² Ibid.137

sikkhāpada.¹ In contrast, it is worth noting that a Bhikkhuni who associates with another Bhikkhuni who had been subjected to a boycott under similar conditions is declared to be guilty only of a Pācittiya offence (*Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ tathāvādinīyā bhikkhuniyā akatānudhammāya taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhāya saddhiṃ sambhuñjeyya vā saṃvaseyya vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeyya pācittiyam*. Bhikkhunī Pācittiya No.147).²

Let us probe further into this apparent discrimination. Both in the Sutta and the Vinaya we come across a number of instances of Bhikkhunis who show strong emotional attachment to Bhikkhus of their choice. Such Bhikkhunis, who often happened to be of frivolous character, seem not only to dedicate their whole life for the service of their chosen comrades, but also to engage themselves actively in canvassing for them the patronage of the laymen. This is clearly evident in the Bhikkhu Pācittiya 29 where Bhikkhuni Thullanandā underrates the greatness of Sāriputta, Moggallāna and other elders in the presence of a house-holder who had invited them. Here, she does so in order to exalt her own

¹ Ibid.IV.218

² This *sikkhāpada* is not given in the Suttavibhaṅga as it is only the Bhikkhuni version of a *sādhāraṇa paññatti* held in common with the Bhikkhus. Hence the number 147 is in terms of the complete text.

favourites like Devadatta, Kokālika and others whom she presents as the stalwarts of the Sāsana.¹ We witness a further embarrassing situation in Pāṭidesaniya 2 where the Chabbaggiya Bhikkhunis personally supervised the feeding of their comrades, the Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus, and saw to it that they got the choicest dishes to the neglect of the rest (*Chabbaggiyā bhikkhuniyo chabbaggiyānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vosāsantiyo thitā honti idha sūpaṃ detha idha odanaṃ dethā'ti. Chabbaggiyā bhikkhū yāvadatthaṃ bhuñjanti aññe bhikkhū na cittarūpaṃ bhuñjanti.* Vin.IV.177). This emotionalism of the Bhikkhunis appears to have gone a step further. In an attempt to defend their comrade monks and maintain their prestige, at times, the Bhikkhunis became pugnacious and offensive. Bhikkhuni Thullanandā once abused the elder Mahā Kassapa calling him the erstwhile heretic because she took exception to his criticism of Ānanda.² Thus the Bhikkhunis ventured to silence the critics and shield themselves and their erring comrades. The attitude of Moliyaphagguna towards the criticisms hurled at his favourite nuns with whom he used to mingle freely and similar reactions on the part of the nuns themselves show that these emotions which the Buddha

¹ Vin.IV.66

² S.II.219f.

referred to as being characteristic of lay householders (*gehasitā chandā gēhasitā vitakkā*) would have been a menace to the healthy and harmonious life of the community.¹ If this tendency of the Bhikkhunis was allowed to continue without restriction it would have served to support and encourage the rebellious dissentients in the Saṅgha. Evidently such Bhikkhus considered the ability to command and count on the support of the Bhikkhunis to be a great asset. Thus it is clear that the vicissitudes of the Bhikkhu Sāsana would have warranted the inclusion of this additional Pārājika of the Bhikkhunis (No. 3.) 'that no Bhikkhuni shall follow a Bhikkhu who had been lawfully subjected to a boycott by the Saṅgha and who subsequently had made no amends for it.'

Saṅghādisesa

The seventeen Saṅghādisesa rules of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha consist of seven which the Bhikkhunis hold in common with the Bhikkhus (*sādhāraṇa paññattī*), and ten additional rules which apply to the Bhikkhunis alone. The Saṅghādisesa rules 1-4 of the Bhikkhus deal with sex abuses or minor sex relations of a Bhikkhu with a woman and therefore have no relevance to the Bhikkhunis. On the other hand, we

¹ M.I.122

have already noted that considerations regarding the sex relations of Bhikkhunis with the male members of the lay society were relatively enhanced in gravity and included under the Bhikkhunī Pārājikas 1 and 4. The other two rules of the Bhikkhu Saṅghādisesas (Nos. 6 and 7) which are left out of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha refer to the construction of dwelling places (*kuṭi* and *vihāra*). Nevertheless, Pācittiya 19 of the Bhikkhus which also happens to deal with dwelling places of monks (*vihāra*) finds its parallel in the following Pācittiya rule of the Bhikkhunis: *Mahallakaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā vihāraṃ kārayamānāya yāva dvāraḥkosā aggaḷaṭṭhapanāya ālokaśandhiparikammāya dvatticchadanassa pariyāyam appaharite ṭhitāya adhiṭṭhātabbaṃ. Tato ce uttarim appaharite pi ṭhitā adhiṭṭhaheyya pācittiyam.*¹ With the omission of these six rules of the Bhikkhu Saṅghādisesa the Bhikkhunis are still left with seven *sādhāraṇa paññatti* or rules which they hold in common with the Bhikkhus under the category of Saṅghādisesa. The ten new rules which take their place under the Bhikkhunī Saṅghādisesas deal with a variety of themes.

¹ The real position of this *sikkhāpada* in the complete Pātimokkha of the Bhikkhunis would be Pācittiya No.115. As this is a *sādhāraṇa paññatti* it is not listed in the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga.

No.1 forbids nuns from entering into hostilities with the laymen. (*Yā pana bhikkhunī ussayavādikā vihareyya gahapatinā vā gahapatiputtana vā dāsena vā kammakārena vā antamaso samaṇaparibbājakenā'pi ayampi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikkaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissārāṇīyaṃ saṅghādīsesaṃ*. Vin.IV.224).

Nos. 2 and 4 provide against the indiscreet admission of doubtful characters into the Bhikkhunī Order without proper investigation and the illegal reinstatement of a properly expelled nun.¹

Nos. 3, 5 and 6 safeguard the nuns from the dangers of lustful men.²

Nos. 7-10 attempt to curb the rebellious and disruptive elements of the Bhikkhunī Order who operate either singly or in groups.³ These four new rules of the Bhikkhunis seem, more or less, to reinforce the Bhikkhu Saṅghādīsesa 9-13 which are also applicable to the Bhikkhunis and which deal with similar situations. Thus we see that with the establishment of the new

¹ Vin.IV.226, 231

² Ibid.227f, 233, 234

³ Ibid.235-42

Order for Bhikkhunis the code of monastic discipline is being made more and more comprehensive.

Nissaggiya Pācittiya

Both the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis have the same number of thirty Nissaggiya Pācittiya rules. But only the following 18 rules of the Bhikkhus are held in common by the Bhikkhunis as well. They are 1-3, 6-10, 18-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30. The 12 rules of the Bhikkhus which do not apply to the Bhikkhunis are as follows:

Nos. 4 and 5 deal with engaging the services of a Bhikkhuni to wash or dye a robe and receiving a robe from a Bhikkhuni respectively.¹

Nos. 11-17 are a set of very specific and circumscribed rules which deal with the making of rugs and coverlets out of silk and wool and their use.²

No. 21 forbids the retention of an extra bowl beyond ten days.³ This rule, however, finds a place among the Bhikkhuni

¹ Vin.III. 06, 209

² Ibid.234-35

³ Ibid.243

Nissaggiyas in a stricter form.¹ The new rule requires that no Bhikkhuni shall make a collection of bowls. This, in its context, is taken to mean that she shall not possess an extra bowl even for a single day. Buddhaghosa points out this difference between the two versions of the rule (*Ayam eva hi viseso. Tattha dasā'haṃ parihāro ettha ekā'ham pi natthi.* VinA.IV.916). Commenting on the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga Buddhaghosa looks upon this rule of the Bhikkhunis as a new one which replaces the former.²

No. 24 specifies the time when a Bhikkhu should make a quest for a rain garment and the time when he should start wearing it.³ This together with the rule which deals with life in forest residences (No.29) were apparently considered as having no relevance to the life of the Bhikkhunis.

No.29 indicates a concession granted to the forest-dwelling monks regarding *cīvaravippavāsa*.⁴

¹ See Nissaggiya Pācittiya No.1 in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. Looked upon as a new rule it is placed in the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. Vin.IV.243

² VinA.IV.919

³ Vin.III.253

⁴ Ibid.263

The Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, on the other hand, has the following rules added to the rest of the Bhikkhu Nissaggiya rules:

No.1. The Nissaggiya Pācittiya group of the Bhikkhunis begins with this revised rule regarding the possession of bowls¹ to which we have referred earlier under Bhikkhu Nissaggiya 21.

Nos. 2 and 3 deal with faulty practices in the acceptance and distribution of robes.²

Nos. 4-10. This section details the abuse of offers made by laymen to provide the Bhikkhunis with their needs either individually or collectively to the congregation as a whole. The indiscreet behaviour of the Bhikkhunis in this direction had proved both irksome and embarrassing to the public.³

Nos. 11 and 12 which deal with the choice and acceptance of robes are closely allied to Nos. 2 and 3.⁴

Pācittiya

Pācittiya is not only the largest of all the groups of *sikkhāpada* laid down for the Bhikkhunis as in the case of

¹ Vin.IV.243

² Ibid.246, 247

³ Ibid.248-54

⁴ Ibid.255, 256

Chapter XIV - The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunīs

Bhikkhus too, but is also the group which has an overwhelmingly large collection of additional rules, amounting to ninety-six,¹ which is four more than the entire group of Bhikkhu Pācittiyas. Of the ninety-two Bhikkhu Pācittiyas, the Bhikkhunīs take seventy which they hold in common with the Bhikkhus. Thus the Bhikkhunīs have a total of 166 *sikkhāpada* under the group of Pācittiya. The additional rules of the Bhikkhunīs may roughly be analysed as pertaining to the following themes.

- | | | |
|---|------|---------|
| (a) Immodest and perverse sex behaviour. | | |
| Nos. 2-5, 21, 31, 32 | | Total 7 |
| (b) Relations with laymen which would impair the life of brahmacariya. | | |
| Nos. 11-14, 36-38, 60 | | Total 8 |
| (c) Boisterous and quarrelsome habits. | | |
| Nos. 18-20, 33, 35, 53, 55, 76. | | Total 8 |
| (d) Frivolous behaviour and lack of moderation in the fulfilment of personal needs. | | |
| Nos. 1, 7-10, 41- 44, 49, 50, 77, 78, | | Total |

¹ Ibid.258-345

84 - 93		23
(e) Impropriety and unceremonious conduct.		
Nos. 15 –17	Total 3
(f) Monastic regulations. The <i>sikkhāpada</i> of this category refer to essentially monastic considerations which apply to the institution of the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. This group of <i>sikkhāpada</i> may be further subdivided as follows.		
i. Robes and garments peculiar to the Bhikkhunis on account of their difference in sex.		
Nos. 22-30, 47, 48, 96.	Total 12
ii. Food.		
Nos. 46, 54.	Total 2
iii. Observance of <i>vassāvāsa</i> or rains-retreat and duties connected with it.		
Nos. 39, 40, 56 –59.	Total 6

Chapter XIV - The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis

iv	Obligations towards fellow- bhikkhunis: teachers and pupils. Nos. 34, 68 –70.	Total 4
v.	Relations with Bhikkhus. Nos. 6. 51, 52, 94, 95.	Total 5
vi	Maintenance of law and order in the community. No. 45.	Total 1
vii	Correct monastic procedure in the conferment of <i>upasampadā</i> etc. Nos. 61-67, 71-75, 79-83.	Total 17

We have already noted above that 70 rules of the Bhikkhu Pācittiya also apply to the Bhikkhunis. Of the twenty-two rules which are therefore peculiar to the Bhikkhus alone and do not apply to the Bhikkhunis, ten deal solely with relationships of Bhikkhus with Bhikkhunis (Nos. 21-30). Out of the *bhojanavagga* of the Bhikkhus which deal with food, four rules do not apply to the Bhikkhunis (Nos. 33, 35, 36, 39). The Bhikkhu Pācittiya 41 which refers to the offer of food by a Bhikkhu to a naked ascetic, a male or female wandering

Chapter XIV - The Disciplinary Code of the Bhikkhunis

ascetic, does not occur in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. The Bhikkhunis have in its place a new *sikkhāpada* which leaves out the reference to the naked ascetic and replaces it with a householder: Bhikkhunī Pācittiya 46. However, in spite of this change, these two *sikkhāpada* look very similar to each other. Compare the Bhikkhu Pācittiya 41:

*Yo pana bhikkhu acelakassa vā paribbājakassa vā
paribbājikāya vā sahatthā khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ
vā dadeyya pācittiyaṃ*

Vin.IV.92.

with the Bhikkhunī Pācittiya 46:

*Yā pana bhikkhunī agārikassa vā paribbājakassa vā
paribbājikāya vā sahatthā khādanīyaṃ vā
bhojanīyaṃ vā dadeyya pācittiyaṃ.*

Vin.IV.302

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the motives which led to the promulgation of these two *sikkhāpada* are different in each case. The Pācittiya rule of the Bhikkhunis (No.46) should be studied together with No.28 of the same group where both the motives and the persons concerned are identical, the only difference being that in one a robe instead of food is given away by a Bhikkhuni. Under both these *sikkhāpada* the Bhikkhuni

concerned is guilty of bribing laymen, for the sake of personal gain or glory, with something belonging to the Bhikkhunis (*Tena kho pana samayena thullanandā bhikkhunī naṭānam'pi naṭakānam'pi ... samaṇacīvaram deti mayham parisati vaṇṇaṃ bhāsathā'ti*. Vin.IV.285). The apparently corresponding *sikkhāpada* of the Bhikkhus (Bhikkhu Pāc.41), on the other hand, has its origin in an incident which is considerably circumscribed. What appears to be quite a harmless act did unexpectedly subject some members of the Order to ridicule in the hands of the heretics. In an attempt to safeguard against the recurrence of such incidents the following general rule, Bhikkhu Pācittiya 41 is laid down: 'No monk shall give, with his own hands, any food unto a naked ascetic, a wandering ascetic, male or female.'

The Bhikkhu Pācittiya 64 is left out of the Bhikkhunī Pācittiyas, perhaps because there is a similar ring in the second additional Pārājika of the Bhikkhunis (*vajja-paṭicchādika*). This rule of the Bhikkhunis, however, refers only to the concealment of Pārājika offences while the Bhikkhu Pācittiya 64 covers both groups of offences, Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa, under the term *duṭṭhullā āpatti*.¹

¹ Vin.IV.127

No. 65 is covered under the new Bhikkhunī Pācittiya 71.¹

Nos. 67 and 83 have relevance to Bhikkhus alone.²

No. 85 gives permission to monks to enter the village out of hours under specified conditions.³ Perhaps we may infer that in leaving it out of the Bhikkhunī Pācittiya, it was intended that the Bhikkhunīs were not to be given even a conditional entry except during proper hours.

No. 89. It is difficult to understand why this rule, which specifies the size of a nisīdana (= a mat to sit on) for the Bhikkhus,⁴ does not apply to the Bhikkhunīs. The fact that nisīdanas were recognised as part of the belongings of the Bhikkhunīs as well is proved by the presence of the parallel of the Bhikkhu Pācittiya 60⁵ under the Pācittiya of the Bhikkhunīs (Pācittiya 141 in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha). Moreover, the

¹ Ibid.130, 327

² Ibid.133, 160

³ Ibid.166

⁴ Ibid.171

⁵ Ibid.123

parallel of the Bhikkhu Pācittiya 87¹, which gives specifications about mañca (bed) and pīṭha (chair), also find a place in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha (Pācittiya 173 in the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha).

No. 91 gives specifications of the size of the vassikasāṭika (= a cloth for the rains).² This, as well as the Bhikkhu Nissaggiya 24 which also refers to the vassikasāṭika, do not apply to the Bhikkhunīs.

Pāṭidesaniya

The eight Pāṭidesaniya rules of the Bhikkhunīs are extremely simple in character and seem in fact to be a splitting up of the single rule which bars a Bhikkhuni, unless she is ill, from obtaining by request and using ghee, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk and curd. The Bhikkhus, on the other hand, have four Pāṭidesaniya rules of their own which also deal with food but are wider in their scope.³ Nos. 1 and 2 determine the relations of Bhikkhus with Bhikkhunīs at meals, and hence have no relevance to the Bhikkhunīs themselves. Nos. 3 and 4 refer to certain situations in which a monk who is not ill should not

¹ Ibid.168

² Ibid.172

³ Vin.IV.175-84

help himself to food. No. 4 deals with it specifically in relation to forest residences. Therefore this rule would not apply to the Bhikkhunis. No. 3 embodies an undoubtedly significant consideration. It prescribes against possible exploitation of pious lay patrons by inconsiderate monks, who while helping themselves to a meal, would fail to consider the economic stability of the people who provide them with food. Here the Buddha decrees that the Bhikkhus should formally decide among themselves not to strain those families of devoted laymen whose resources are depleted. The Bhikkhus shall not call on them and accept food unless on invitation or in cases of illness.

Sekhiya dhamma.

Both Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis share the same set of seventy-five Sekhiya dhammas.

The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha

The text of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha seems to have presented a number of problems to the scholars who ventured to examine it. Miss Durga N. Bhagavat who apparently approached it solely through the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga of the present Vinaya Piṭaka discovered therein only a fragment of it. She has erred so far as to mistake this abridged version for the

complete text.¹ The result of this has been obviously disastrous as has already been pointed out by Miss Horner.² Miss Horner suggests that the Nuns' Vibhaṅga in its present form may be regarded as an abridged version of some more complete Vibhaṅga for nuns.³ In support of this she adduces as evidence the fragment of the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Sarvāstivādins published by Finot.⁴ The Bhikṣunī-prātimokṣa in it, it is pointed out, contains the end of one *sikkhāpada* and the beginning of another which are identified as Saṅghādisesas for nuns corresponding to Monks' Saṅghādisesa 8 and 9. This leads us to the legitimate inference that there existed at some stage among the Sarvāstivādins a complete, unabridged Prātimokṣa for the Bhikṣunis. However, the earlier hypothesis of the existence of 'a more complete Vibhaṅga for nuns' is not necessarily established thereby, because there is evidence to show that the Prātimokṣasūtras which came to be recited fortnightly at the Uposatha meetings existed quite distinctly apart from the Vibhaṅgas, and very naturally in an unabridged form.

¹ Miss D.N. Bhagavat, *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, p.164f.

² *The Book of the Discipline*, III. p. xxxii. n.1 and p. I viii.

³ *Ibid.*p.xxxi

⁴ *Journal Asiatique*, 1913, p.548

On the other hand, as we examine the early literary history of the Vinaya Piṭaka we discover evidence which point to the existence of a complete and unabridged text of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. Buddhaghosa, while describing the Vinaya texts which were rehearsed at the First Council, speaks of the Ubhato Vibhaṅga consisting of the Mahāvibhaṅga and the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. These two texts, it is said, were gone through separately each in its entirety. The Mahāvibhaṅga, says Buddhaghosa, consists of 220 rules (*Evam vīsādhikāni dve sikkhāpadasatāni mahāvibhaṅgo'ti kittetvā thapesum*. DA.I.13). We should note here how precise Buddhaghosa is in not adding the 7 Adhikaraṇasamatha dhammas to the list of *sikkhāpada*, as most scholars do, when they speak of 227 rules of the Pātimokkha, the 7 Adhikaranasamatha dhammas to the list of disciplinary rules.¹ The Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga consists of 304

¹ B.C.Law, History of Pali Literature, I.46-47, 49

Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, II.24

N.Dutt, Early Monastic Buddhism, 1960, p.152

S.Dutt, Early Buddhist Monachism, p.75

Miss Horner, Book of the Discipline, I.p.x.

Rhys Davids, Buddhism, its History and Literature, 1896, p. 54.

However, in The Questions of King Milinda he says that the regulations in the Pātimokkha are only 220 in number. See SBE 35, p.203.n.1 (1890).

rules, and not 311 for the same reason. (*Evaṃ tīni sikkhāpadasatāni cattāri ca sikkhāpadāni bhikkhunīvibhaṅgo'ti kittetvā...* Ibid.) This shows that at least the tradition which Buddhaghosa inherited knew of an early reckoning of the contents of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga independent of the Mahāvibhaṅga, and it leads us to surmise on the independent existence of a complete Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga.

Further it is worth noting that Buddhaghosa, while speaking of the literary activity of the First Council, does not speak of an independent rehearsal of either of the Pātimokkhas apart from the Vibhaṅgas, although he goes so far as to include both the Khandhakas and the Parivāra under the Vinaya literature rehearsed at the First Council.¹ The two Pātimokkhas were apparently reckoned as being part and parcel of the two respective Vibhaṅgas at that stage. This is clear from the manner in which the elder Mahā Kassapa questioned the venerable Upāli from the first Pārājika onwards inquiring not only about the rule but also about the details connected with it.

Even as far as the function of the Pātimokkha was concerned, it is evident that in the early days of Buddhist monasticism much importance was attached to the meaning

¹ DA.I.13

and interpretation, and all the implications of the *sikkhāpada*. It was also necessary for the proper enforcement of the law that those who were in authority knew all the circumstances leading to the promulgation of the various *sikkhāpada*. Therefore it is not unusual to find a monk being challenged regarding the authenticity of a particular item of discipline which he wishes to enforce. Thus, the maintenance of acceptable good monastic conduct being the live function of the Pātimokkha, it was necessary for a monk, specially for one who was in authority such as a Vinayadhara or a Bhikkhunovādaka,¹ to learn both codes of the Pātimokkha in detail with all the explanations. Note the significance of the following observations: 'If a monk is not well-versed in both codes of the Pātimokkha with all their details and explanations, then if he were to be questioned as to where the Buddha has laid down such and such an injunction, he would not be able to give an answer. Then there would be many who would advise him to first learn his Vinaya.' (*No ce bhikkhave bhikkhuno ubhayāni pātimokkhāni vitthārena svāgatāni honti suvibhattāni suppavattīni suvinicchitāni suttaso anuvyañjanaso idaṃ pana āyasmā kattha vuttaṃ bhagavatā'ti puṭṭho na sampāyati. Tassa bhavanti vattāro ingha tāva āyasmā vinayaṃ sikkhassū'ti.* A.V.80f.). There is no doubt, that

¹ A.IV.140, 279; V.71

all these requirements imply a thorough knowledge of the texts of the Vibhaṅga. Buddhaghosa, in fact, explains *suttaso* of the above passage as *vibhāgato*.¹ In the Samantapāsādikā, he explains the phrase *vitthārena svāgatāni* which also occurs in the above passage as implying a knowledge of the twofold Vibhaṅga (*Tattha ubhayāni kho pana'ssa pātimokkhāni vitthārena svāgatāni hontī'ti ubhato vibhaṅgavasena vuttāni*. VinA.V.990).

However, it is clear that Buddhaghosa was aware of the existence in his own day of the two Pātimokkhas as independent literary works, besides the two Vibhaṅgas, in the Vinaya Piṭaka. In a general description of the Vinaya Piṭaka, Buddhaghosa adds to its contents the two Pātimokkhas as well, which now take their stand side by side with the Vibhaṅgas, the Khandhakas and the Parivāra. (*Tattha paṭhamasaṅgītiyaṃ saṅgītañ ca asaṅgītañ ca sabbam pi samodhānetvā ubhayāni pātimokkhāni dve vibhaṅgāni dvāvīsati khandhakā soḷasaparivārā'ti idaṃ vinayaṭṭakam nāma*).² He also makes it clear in this statement that not all the contents of the extant Vinaya Piṭaka were rehearsed at the First Council.

¹ AA.IV.66

² DA.I.17; VinA.I.18; DhsA.18

It is not possible to determine with any certainty the time when the Pātimokkha (of the Bhikkhus and the Bhikkhunis) were thus extracted from the Vibhaṅgas. All that we can safely infer from the statements of Buddhaghosa is that it certainly took place before his time, but at a date which does not go so far back as the First Council. Hence the absence in the Cullavagga of any reference to the Pātimokkha as a Vinaya treatise during the recital of the Vinaya at the First Council.¹ The independent existence of the Bhikkhu and Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha in their entirety, at least during the time of Buddhaghosa, is clearly evident in the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī of Buddhaghosa. We notice there that Buddhaghosa is familiar with an unabridged text of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. In commenting, however, on the *sikkhāpada* of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, he recognises the items which the Bhikkhunis hold in common with the Bhikkhus (*sādhāraṇa paññattiyo*) and refers back for their explanation to his comments on those identical *sikkhāpada* in the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha. He commences his Bhikkhunīpātimokkha-vaṇṇā with a comment on the first Pārājika, the first of the eight Pārājikas of the Bhikkhunis which incidentally also happens to be a *sādhāraṇa paññatti*. (*Yā pana bhikkhunī chandaso methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭiseveyyā'ti*

¹ See S.Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.73f.

vuttaṃ tattha chandaso'ti methunarāgapaṭisamyuttena chandena c'eva ruciyā ca ... Kkvt.157). Therefore he refers to the rest of the common *sikkhāpada* in the following terms: `Here and in the instances which follow, the rest should be understood with the help of the explanations given under the common injunctions which the Bhikkhus share with the Bhikkhunis.'*(Sesaṃ ettha itoparesu ca sādharmaṇasikkhāpadesu vuttanayānusāren'eva veditabbaṃ.* Kkvt.157). That in the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī Buddhaghosa was commenting on a complete text of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha is further evident in the remarks which he adds after his comments on the first six rules of the Bhikkhunī Saṅghādisesas which are peculiar to the nuns alone. Noting that the next three Saṅghādisesas, i.e. nos. 7, 8 and 9, are held in common with the Bhikkhus, Buddhaghosa says that their explanations are to be known in terms of what has been said about the triad which begins with the *sikkhāpada* on *sañcaritta* (*sañcarittādittaye vuttanayen'eva vinicchayo veditabbo.* Kkvt.165), and refers them back to the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha. They were, nevertheless, reckoned as forming a part of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, for Buddhaghosa proceeds to number the *sikkhāpada* which follows these three as the tenth (*Dasame kinnu' mā'va samaṇiyo'ti.* Kkvt.165). When Buddhaghosa, following this order, regards the succeeding *sikkhāpada* as No.11, the editor of the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī (P.T.S.)

hastens to make the following comment: `This really refers to the Saṅghādisesa 8 as given at Vin.IV.238 and not to No.11. There are only 10 in the recognised Pali Canon.'¹ It should here be pointed out that this attempted correction is not only unwarranted but is also dangerously misleading. After Saṅghādisesa 13 of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, Buddhaghosa is aware of the existence of four more *sikkhāpada* for the Bhikkhunis under the Saṅghādisesa which the Bhikkhunis share in common with the Bhikkhus (*Saṅgha-bhedādisu catusu vuttanayen'eva vinicchayo veditabbo*. Kkvt.166). Thus Buddhaghosa winds up his comments on the Saṅghādisesas of the Bhikkhunis with commendable accuracy, thereby establishing the existence of 17 *sikkhāpada* in that group.

Attention has already been drawn to the change of emphasis in the ritual of Pātimokkha at a time when the mere recital of the *sikkhāpada* at the assembly of the Bhikkhus, without any evident probe into the incidents of indiscipline, constituted the ritual of the Uposatha. At such a function, it was obviously the text of the Pātimokkha rules that mattered. The details of interpretation and application which were closely connected with the rules and thus formed an essential part of the Vibhaṅga would have been eventually left out. This, perhaps, explains the extraction

¹ Kkvt.p.165

of the rules of the Pātimokkha from the body of the Vibhaṅgas and the formation out of these of the two manuals of Bhikkhu and Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, intended undoubtedly to be used for recital at the ritual of the Uposatha. Thus it is the consequent independent existence of the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, in its entirety, which in all probability, could have justified the abridgement of the text of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga into the form in which we have it today. The Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga was an abridged text even at the time of Buddhaghosa and the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha as well as the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha had already acquired an independent position in the Vinaya Piṭaka.¹ Thus in marked contrast to the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇi which is Buddhaghosa's commentary on the two Pātimokkhas, Buddhaghosa commences his Bhikkhunīvibhaṅgavaṇṇanā in the Samantapāsādikā with the first additional Pārājika of the Bhikkhunis which he treats as No.1, for he proceeds to the rest of the four *asādhāraṇa paññatti* as *dutiya*, *tatiya* and *catuttha*, i.e. second, third and fourth respectively. He follows the same method in the Saṅghādisesa as well as in the other succeeding groups of *sikkhāpada*. In the Samantapāsādikā we discover an implicit admission of Buddhaghosa that the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga which is before him is an abridged text containing only the

¹ DA.I.17; VinA.I.18; DhsA.18

asādhāraṇa paññattiyo. Commenting on the phrase *uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo atṭha pārājikā dhammā* he first refers to the four Pārājikas laid down for the Bhikkhus (*...bhikkhū ārabba paññattā sādhāraṇā cattāro.* VinA.IV.906) and offers four only as the contents of the Pārājika group of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (*...ime ca cattāro'ti* - Ibid.). Affirming as it were our earlier assumption that the recital at the ritual of the Uposatha was now the immediate and perhaps the single purpose of the Pātimokkha, Buddhaghosa says that the Pātimokkha recital brings before us the complete list of Bhikkhunī *sikkhāpada* (*... evaṃ pātimokkhuddesamaggena uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo atṭha pārājikā dhammā'ti evam ettha attho daṭṭhabbo.* Ibid.). This establishes beyond doubt the position that in Buddhaghosa's day there existed an abridged Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga and an unabridged Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha.

APPENDIX I

The Exclusion of Guilty Monks From The Recital of the Pātimokkha

Let us examine the statements in the Khandhakas under the authority of which a monk who was guilty of an offence (*sāpattika*) was barred from participating in the ritual of the Pātimokkha.¹ A careful scrutiny of these two accounts shows that this authority was derived from the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha in the Cullavagga.² When Vin.I.125 says that the Buddha has decreed that no guilty monk shall participate in the performance of the Uposatha it has evidently in mind this incident of the Cullavagga. This story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha appears also in two other Canonical texts, viz. the Udāna³ and the Aṅguttara Nikāya.⁴

¹ Vin.I.125 and Vin.II.240

² Vin.II.236ff.

³ Ud.51ff.

⁴ A.IV.204ff.

It is interesting to compare here this version of the Theriya tradition with that of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.¹ The following observations emerge from such a comparison:

1. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda account, it is not the Buddha but the Saṅghasthavira who presides over the assembly at which the guilty monk is discovered. Thus the entire Theriya version that the Buddha, up to this incident, held the monopoly of reciting the Pātimokkha in the assembly of the monks finds no support among the Mūlasarvāstivādins.² It is clearly stated in the Mūlasarvāstivāda account that the Buddha had ordered that the Saṅghasthavira should recite the Pātimokkha every fortnight.³ (*Uktaṃ bhagavatā saṅghasthavirena tvardhamāsaṃ prātimokṣasūtroddesa uddeṣṭavya iti.* Gilgit MSS.III.3.107f.). This order, at any rate, is prior to the incident of the discovery of the guilty monk in the assembly which had met for the recital of the Pātimokkha.

¹ Gilgit MSS.III.3.107f.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

2. The Mūlasarvāstivādins do not draw the elder Mahā Moggallāna into the picture. It is the Saṅghasthavira himself who uses his 'divine eye' to spot out the guilty monk.
3. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda account, unlike in the Theriya tradition where the elder Moggallāna uses his power of clairvoyance (*cetopariyañāṇa*), the use of the 'divine eye' or the 'divine ear' for this purpose is condemned and forbidden by the Buddha. One who does so is guilty of an offence.

It appears from the above analysis that the Mūlasarvāstivādins too, agree with the Theravādins in their tradition that no guilty monk shall participate in the recital of the Pātimokkha. This is evidently true of most Vinaya traditions for they had been firmly stratified before the break up of the monastic community into distinct schools. In spite of their elimination of the Buddha and the elder Moggallāna from this incident, the Mūlasarvāstivādins are loosely linked with the Theravādins in this matter in that the *uddāna gāthā* which prefaces their Poṣadhassthāpanavastu mentions the role of Moggallāna in penalising the guilty monk: *Asaudhapoṣadhādbhikṣur maudgalyāṇena nāśītaḥ*. Gilgit MSS.III.3.107. But there is no doubt that the Mūlasarvāstivādins

found the whole setting of this incident to be somewhat clumsy and in part unacceptable.

This leads us further to examine the contents of this chapter in the Cullavagga on the Suspension of the Pātimokkha and observe the procedure adopted in excluding the guilty monk from the recital of the Pātimokkha.¹ The elder Moggallāna tells the guilty monk that he has no right to sit together with the Bhikkhus: *Natthi te bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ saṃvāso'ti*. Vin.II.237. It is difficult to see from where the venerable Moggallāna derives the authority for such an accusation. It appears possible only under the terms of Pārājika offences about which alone the Vinaya says that no monk who is guilty of any one of them shall have the right of co-residence with fellow Bhikkhus. It is further added that such a monk forfeits his right of being a Bhikkhu.² (*Uddiṭṭhā kho āyasmanto cattāro pārājikā dhammā yesaṃ bhikkhu aññataraṃ vā aññataraṃ vā āpajjitvā na labhati bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ yathā pure tathā pacchā pārājiko hoti asaṃvāso* - Vin.III.109).³

¹ Vin.II.236ff.

² Ibid.III.109

³ We should here take note of the explanation which the Commentaries give for the exclusion of the guilty monk from the assembly which had met for the recital of the Pātimokkha by the

Then in terms of what criteria is the *pārisuddhi* or purity of the monk concerned challenged in this context? There is not a single specific charge which makes him a *sāpattika* in the sense that is familiar to us in the Vinaya. Is it to be inferred that no *sikkhāpada* had been laid down up to this stage? If that is conceded then this monk should have enjoyed the normal benefit of an *ādikammika*, i.e. of being exempted from guilt in the absence of *sikkhāpada: anāpatti ādikammikassa*. If *sikkhāpada* had already been laid down then this non-specific and all-inclusive charge seems hardly justifiable.

If up to the time of this incident no *sikkhāpada* had been laid down then it is hardly possible to imagine that the monks would have been in a position to start forthwith a Pātimokkha recital of their own. (Note: *Na dānā'haṃ bhikkhave itoparaṃ uposathaṃ karissāmi pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi. Tumhe'va'dāni bhikkhave itoparaṃ uposathaṃ kareyyātha pātimokkhaṃ uddiseyyātha.* Vin.II.240)¹ At any rate, if this incident, contrary to the evidence

Buddha. It is said that if the Buddha recited the Pātimokkha with the guilty monk present in the assembly it would have spelt disaster for the guilty monk: *sattadhā tassa muddhā phālessati*. Thus, out of compassion for him the Buddha declined to recite the Pātimokkha in that assembly. See UdA.296; AA.IV.112

¹ The Commentarial tradition maintains that the recital of *sikkhāpada*

of Vin.I.102, marks the real beginning of the recital of the Pātimokkha by the Bhikkhus, then it is also to be argued that the recital of the Pātimokkha by the Bhikkhus begins with the assumption that guilty monks should be excluded from the recital. But we have already seen that all available evidence point to the contrary.¹ Thus the assumption that all participants at the recital should be pure has to be regarded as the development of a relatively later concept. The story that the Buddha suspended his recital of the Pātimokkha to the Bhikkhus because of the presence of the guilty monk in the assembly contrives to lend support to this growing idea.

We should also like to examine at this stage some evidence which comes to us from the Chinese versions of the Buddhist Vinaya. According to the Vinaya of the Mahīśasakas² the Saṅghasthavira who presides at the Pātimokkha recital asks the assembly as to what the Saṅgha is going to do. The Bhikkhus in reply recommend that various forms of disciplinary action such as the Tajjaniya-kamma be carried out on certain monks. They also specify that penalties like Mānatta be

as the Pātimokkha (*āṇā pātimokkha*) belongs exclusively to the Bhikkhus and not to the Buddha. See VinA.I.187; UdA.298.

¹ M.III.10; Vin.I.103; IV.144

² *Taisho*, Vol.22. p.128 C

imposed. It can hardly be denied that these statements are in perfect accord with what has been laid down in the Suttas of the Theriya tradition. Nevertheless, side by side with this older tradition the Mahiśāsakas accommodate a tradition which is akin to that of the Khandhakas regarding the Suspension of the Pātimokkha.

On the other hand, the Mahāsaṅghikas¹ seem to feel that the non-specific charge which is brought against the guilty monk is inadequate for purposes of prosecution. So they have a new story according to which the monk who stands accused had stealthily picked up a golden lotus petal which was a part of the decoration of the Uposatha hall and had fallen on the ground. This new situation which is added to the story enables the venerable Moggallāna, perhaps on account of the offence of stealing, to give the verdict that from that day the monk who was involved would not be regarded as a *samaṇa*. He is further told that he should not be any more among the members of the Saṅgha. The Mahāsaṅghikas also go so far as to make the Buddha declare the action of Moggallāna in dragging the guilty monk out of the assembly to be illegal.

¹ *Taisho*, Vol. 22. p.447 B

We would consider this divergence in the Mahāsaṅghika tradition to be a very significant one. In the light of other evidence in the Suttas and in the Vinaya we are led to consider the exclusion of the guilty monk from the ritual of the Pātimokkha as striking a discordant note. In presenting a new and a legally more acceptable basis for the exclusion of the guilty monk, the Mahāsaṅghikas undoubtedly reveal their distrust of the soundness of the Theriya tradition and the validity of the act of exclusion as described in the Cullavagga. The Mahāsaṅghikas, while they inherit along with the Theriya group and other early divisions of the Saṅgha the earlier story of this incident *in toto*, seem to challenge its conformity to orthodox canons.

There is yet another point in this story which runs contrary to what appears to be historically acceptable. The story of the Cullavagga tries to make out that up to the detection of the guilty monk in the assembly of the Saṅgha it was the practice of the Buddha to recite the Pātimokkha for the Bhikkhus. We have already observed that the Mūlasarvāstivādin differ from the Theriya tradition on this point in keeping the Buddha out of the Pātimokkha recital. The only other Canonical reference in the Theriya tradition to the recital of the Pātimokkha by the Buddha¹

¹ i.e. other than in the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha

comes to us from the Mahāpadāna Sutta.¹ But this quasi-historical Sutta makes this statement in terms of a Buddha of the past. Placed in a legendary and supernatural setting the Buddha Vipassi, the first of the group of six previous Buddhas, expresses his desire to order his disciples to return to Bandhumatī at the end of every six years, after their missionary travels, to participate in the Pātimokkha recital.² Thereupon a great Brahmā appears on the scene and requests him to make the order and pledges their support to see that the disciples do so. The Sutta goes on to describe how the divinities thereafter play their role in reminding the Bhikkhus annually, in anticipation, about their return to the capital for the Pātimokkha recital. When the appointed time comes they make a further contribution by transporting the Bhikkhus to the venue of the recital in a single day by their supernatural power. When the assembly of Bhikkhus meets, the Buddha Vipassi recites before them three stanzas which are traceable to the Buddhavagga of

which occurs at Vin.II. 236f, Udāna 51f, A.IV.204f.

¹ D.II.46ff.

² A tradition in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā makes out the recital to be held every seventh year. See DhpA.III.237

the Dhammapada.¹ The Sutta describes this as the recital of the Pātimokkha by the Buddha Vipassi.

Strangely enough, we discover in the last of these stanzas² a reference to the restraint in terms of the Pātimokkha (*Pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro*). We are already familiar with this concept of discipline and are aware of its connotation. The Commentary to the Sutta explains this as the restraint in the highest *sīla* which is identifiable with the code of the Pātimokkha.³ Thus when the Pātimokkha as a code of discipline seems to have been well established and its functions appear to have been well known during the life time of the Buddha how does one explain this unnecessary regressing to present the Pātimokkha and its recital as being primitively simple. As there is no reliable evidence at all, excepting what we implicitly get in the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha, to show that the Buddha did preside for some time over a form of Pātimokkha recital we are compelled to regard the other abundant evidence pointing to the early existence of a Pātimokkha recital which the Buddha instituted for the Bhikkhus and which the Bhikkhus

¹ Dhammapada vv.183,184,185. See Dhpa.III.237.

² Ibid.v.185. It is a pity that Sukumar Dutt has completely missed this very significant stanza. See his *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.71

³ DA.II.479

themselves performed from its inception as being more positive and reliable.

It is only with a considerable recognition of such an institution that one could expect the emergence of a standardised concept like *pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro*. To take this concept back to antiquity and link it up with a primitive and less organized institution appears to be a serious distortion. This retrospective use of the term Pātimokkha to refer to the mere recital of the three stanzas by the Buddha appears to be unhistorical. Furthermore, the past to which it is drawn is also enveloped in what comes more in the realm of myth and legend. Thus it is undoubtedly a projection from the present and the historical to the past and the legendary. This tendency to delve into the past, in a search as it were for precedent and traditional sanction, is clearly seen in many instances in the life story of the Buddha and the history of the Sāsana.¹ Such sanction seems to be sought both for what has historically taken place and also for what is intended to be approved as historical and acceptable. The whole of the Mahāpadāna Sutta seems to illustrate this tendency.

¹ S.II.5-9, 106; A.II.21; Vin.III.7ff.

We discover in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā a story which appears to give a cross reference to this semi-legendary account of the Buddhas of the past of the Mahāpadāna Sutta.¹ In a very brief story entitled Ānandattherauposathapañhavatthu the venerable Ānanda states that although the Buddha has given details regarding the parentage, disciples etc. of the seven Buddhas including the Buddha Gotama himself he has said nothing about the nature of the Uposatha of the past Buddhas.² Therefore he raises the question whether their Uposatha was the same as the present one or different from it. The Buddha replies to say that there is no difference in the content of what is recited at the Uposatha. The only difference is in the frequency of its performance (*Yasmā pana tesam buddhānaṃ kālabhedo eva ahoṣi na gāthābhedo* - Dhpa.III.236). Establishing the identity of the Uposatha of all the seven Buddhas he says that they all recited three admonitory stanzas before their assemblies. These stanzas are the same as those mentioned in the Mahāpadāna Sutta with reference to the Buddha Vipassi. This story strives to establish,

¹ Dhpa.III.236

² However, this is not true of the extant Mahāpadāna Sutta which gives a detailed account of the Pātimokkha recital of the Buddha Vipassi. See D.II.47- 49

above all, that the Buddha Gotama did perform some form of admonitory Upssatha and that it is distinctly in the tradition of the Buddhas of the past. In doing so this story of the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā goes a step further than the Mahāpadāna Sutta which speaks of the Uposatha only of Buddha Vipassī. Nevertheless, there is no serious divergence between the two accounts.

Buddhaghosa, in his comments on the Verañjabhāṇavāra, has attempted to integrate this tradition with the history of the Sāsana. This, he says, is the general practice of all Buddhas and the Buddha Gotama too, did recite a form of *ovāda pātimokkha* for twenty years in the history of the Sāsana up to the promulgation of the *sikkhāpada*.¹ But this twofold Pātimokkha as *ovāda* and *āṇā* in two distinct chronological stages is a product of commentarial tradition. The only Canonical reference to two stages of the Pātimokkha recital is the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha in the Cullavagga.² However, we are not told there that these are two distinct types of Pātimokkha recital. All that we are told is that the Buddha refused to recite the Pātimokkha any more in the company of the Bhikkhus and asked them to do it themselves.

¹ VinA.I.186f.

² Vin.II.236ff.

In the Mahāpadāna Sutta the Buddha Vipassi himself recites the admonitory stanzas and this alone constitutes the Pātimokkha recital in his Sāsana.¹ At no stage is this replaced by another form of recital in the Mahāpadāna Sutta. Even the account in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā preserves this singleness of character of the recital of the Buddhas of the past.² This form of *ovāda pātimokkha* which originally was associated with Buddha Vipassi of distant antiquity is extremely simple and primitive and seems characteristic of a legendary past.³ The Canonical texts do not seem to mix this up with the Pātimokkha recital of the Buddha Gotama's Sāsana which is more historical in character. It is Buddhaghosa who attempts to trace the change over of the Pātimokkha from *ovāda* to *āṇā* and give it a historical sequence and the story of the Suspension of the Pātimokkha in the Cullavagga seems to facilitate this.⁴ In

¹ The Sutta, however, does not use the term *ovāda pātimokkha* with reference to this recital.

² DhP.A.III.236

³ D.II.48-50

⁴ See VinA. I.186 f. where Buddhaghosa quotes extensively from Vin.II.240. *Sabbabuddhānaṃ hi imā tisso ovādapātimokkhagāthā honti. Tā dīghāyukabuddhānaṃ yāva sāsana-pariyantā uddesaṃ āgacchanti. Appāyukabuddhānaṃ paṭhamabodhiyam eva sikkhāpadapaññattikālato pabhuti āṇāpātimokkham eva uddisīyati.*

this attempt of Buddhaghosa we see the romanticised tales of the Buddhas of the past invading the truly historical accounts of the life and the Sāsana of the Buddha Gotama.

On the other hand, it is interesting to analyse at this stage the contents of the *Verañjabhāṇavāra* which has a relevance to this question.¹ In reply to a question by the venerable Sāriputta the Buddha discusses the history of the monastic organizations of the six Buddhas of the past. They are classified into two groups of three each on a purely chronological order. It is said that the three earlier Buddhas, Vipassi, Sikhī and Vessabhū, did neither lay down *sikkhāpada* nor institute the Pātimokkha recital for their disciples. Their discourses on the Dhamma were very meagre. In consequence of this, their monastic organizations disintegrated soon after their death. Of the latter three, Kakusandha, Konāgamana and Kassapa, we discover that their organizations flourished because they preached the Dhamma extensively to their disciples and also laid down *sikkhāpada* and instituted the recital of the Pātimokkha. No more is said here of

Tañ ca kho bhikkhū yeva uddisanti na buddhā. Tasmā amhākam'pi bhagavā paṭhamabodhiyaṃ vīsativassamattaṃ eva idaṃ ovādapātimokkhaṃ uddisi. Tato paṭṭhāya bhikkhū āṇāpātimokkhaṃ uddisanti. VinA.I.187

¹ Vin.III.7-9

the nature of this Pātimokkha recital, either of Gotama or of the Buddhas of the past. Nor is there any indication about one form of recital being replaced by another.

Even though we may not regard this portion of the Suttavibhaṅga to be as old as the rest which deal with the text of the Pātimokkha, we cannot but be impressed by its conformity to the early traditions of the Sutta and the Vinaya. What we mean by this is the recognition of the fact that the promulgation of the *sikkhāpada* and their recital by the Bhikkhus at the Pātimokkha assembly together formed the basic structure of the Sāsana and its earliest institutions which safeguarded it. Thus we see that what is said about the Buddhas of the past in the Verañjabhāṇavāra is a very accurate projection into the past of a distinct historical setting.

Hence the idea of a primitive form of Pātimokkha recital by the Buddha Gotama seems to be in all probability a product of wishful construction which besides whatever other purpose it serves helps the legislation against the presence of guilty monks at the Pātimokkha recital. For it is at this point that the Buddha abolishes the practice of the *ovāda pātimokkha* under protest and hands over the recital of the Pātimokkha to the Bhikkhus. What is more significant here is the legislation which

followed this incident.¹ (*Na ca bhikkhave sāpattikena pātimokkhaṃ sotabbaṃ. Yo suṇeyya āpatti dukkaṭassa.* Vin.II.240). The presence of the guilty monk in the assembly being the provocation which led to the abolition of the *ovāda pātimokkha* the Buddha laid down the rule, applicable to the *āṇā pātimokkha* of the Bhikkhus, that no guilty monk shall participate in the Pātimokkha recital. The incident of the abolition of the *ovāda pātimokkha* undoubtedly provides a very convincing situation for this new legislation. However, we have already pointed out that it is clearly a deviation from the original spirit of the Pātimokkha recital.

¹ Ibid.II.240. See also Vin.I.125

APPENDIX II
The Abolition of the Lesser and
Minor Rules of Training

The history of the Sāsana, both in the Sutta and the Vinaya Piṭakas, shows that there were rebellious monks in the Order. Their protests against the disciplinary measures adopted by the Buddha are widely scattered in the Pali texts where such monks are described as being militant and intolerant of any advice (*Dubbacā kho bhante etarahi bhikkhū dovacassakaraṇehi dhammehi samannāgatā akkhamā appadakkhiṇaggāhino anusāsaniṃ*. S.II.204).¹ The words of Subhadda, who was discovered expressing his joy on the passing away of the Buddha, mark the climax of this tendency.² There was a formidable move in this direction even during the life time of the Buddha and he was well aware of it. In the Laṭukikopama Sutta, the Buddha states very clearly that there exists a group of misguided disciples who when being told by him to give up

¹ See also M.I.437f, 448f; A.I.230, 236; Vin.III.177, IV.142f.

² Vin.II.284f.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

certain ways of life which are unworthy of a monk refuse to do so. They in turn accuse the Buddha of being meticulous and pronounce judgement on him that he worries over worthless trifles. They show their displeasure not only at him as the law-giver but also at the other good disciples who abide by these laws (*Evaṃ eva kho udāyi idh'ekacce moghapurisā idaṃ pajahathā'ti mayā vuccamānā te evaṃ āhaṃsu kiṃ pan'imassa appamattakassa oramattakassa adhisallikhat'evā'yaṃ samano'ti. Te tañ c'eva nappajahanti mayi ca appaccayaṃ upaṭṭhāpentī ye ca bhikkhū sikkhākāmā. M.I.449*).

A specific instance of such accusation against the Buddha is recorded in the Aṅguttara Nikāya where a Bhikkhu named Kassapagotta of Paṅkadha protests at a discourse of the Buddha in which he deals with monastic discipline (*Atha kho kassapagottassa bhikkhuno bhagavatā sikkhāpadapaṭisaṃyuttāya dhammiyā kathāya bhikkhū sandassante samādapente samuttejente ahu'deva akkhanti ahu appaccayo adhisallikhat'evā'yaṃ samaṇo'ti. A.I.236*). Regardless of the avowed purpose of Buddhist monasticism these rebels appear to have looked upon *sikkhāpada* as measures calculated to restrict their freedom and the liberty to do things as they wish. This is clearly evident from the history

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

and the text of Pācittiya 72 which is laid down against the disciples who speak disparagingly of the *sikkhāpada* of the Vinaya Piṭaka (*Sace ime vinaye pakataññuno bhavissanti amhe yena icchakaṃ yad'icchakaṃ yāvad'icchakaṃ ākaḍḍhissanti parikaḍḍhissanti. Handa mayaṃ āvuso vinayaṃ vivaṇṇemā'ti.*). Also: (*Yo pana bhikkhu pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadeyya kiṃ paṇ'imehi khuddānu-khuddakehi sikkhāpadehi udduṭṭhehi yāvad'eva kukkuccāya vihesāya vilekhāya samvattantī'ti sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake pācittiyaṃ. Vin.IV.143.*) This is undoubtedly the reason why a section of the monastic community expressed their sense of freedom on the death of the Master and stated in no uncertain terms that they were in a position to act on their own choice and would not be pestered any more with instructions on propriety and procedure (*Sumuttā mayaṃ tena mahāsamaṇena. Upaddutā ca mayaṃ homa idaṃ vo kappati idaṃ vo na kappatī'ti. Idāni pana mayaṃ yaṃ icchissāma taṃ karissāma yaṃ na icchissāma na taṃ karissāmā'ti. Vin.II.284.*).

The Buddha was not only aware of the gathering momentum against the organization of discipline but also felt it necessary to pay sufficient heed to it. On the one hand, he would keep the good disciples informed of this calamitous situation as is clear

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

from the words of the Buddha to Udāyi in the Laṭukikopama Sutta.¹ He would praise the virtues of the law-abiding Bhikkhus as he did when he discovered the attitude of the venerable Upasena Vaṅgantaputta to the code of monastic discipline (*Sādhū sādhu upasena na apaññattaṃ paññāpetabbaṃ paññattaṃ vā na samucchinditabbaṃ yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattitabbaṃ*. Vin.III.231). Such willing submission to monastic discipline was a cause of joy to the founder of the Order. In the Kakacūpama Sutta the Buddha is happy to recollect his associations with such disciples. There was a time, says the Buddha, when the monks won his heart by their good behaviour. He also often held out such good monks as an example to the rest. The venerable Mahā Kassapa was a dominant personality of that category about whose exemplary character the Buddha repeatedly mentioned (*Kassapena vā hi vo bhikkhave ovaḍissāmi yo vā kassapasadiso. Ovaḍitehi ca pana vo tathattāya paṭipajjitabban'ti*. S.II.195).

On the other hand, the Buddha also took more active disciplinary measures by incorporating in the code of discipline itself legislation against such vicious moves to undermine

¹ M.I.449

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

monastic discipline. The rebels directed their attack against the regulations of the Vinaya, their main target being the *sikkhāpada* of the Pātimokkha. Out of a sense of fear of prosecution the miscreants thought it advantageous to keep as many members of the Order as possible ignorant of the contents of the Vinaya. It is said that they therefore spoke very disparagingly of the Vinaya to every one.¹ They challenged the usefulness of the recital of the lesser and minor rules (*khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni*) at the ritual of the Pātimokkha. It only wearies and vexes the listeners, they said (*Kiṃ pan'imehi khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi. Yāvad'eva kukkucāya vihesāya vilekhāya saṃvattatīti.* Vin.IV.143). They oppose the recital at the Uposatha of the whole code of Pātimokkha regulations. The lesser and minor rules are slighted and an attempt is made to eliminate them from the Pātimokkha recital. This means that the conduct of no monk would be questioned any more in terms of these *sikkhāpada*. This attitude would stand in marked contrast to the assumption of the Vajjiputtaka monk who thought that he had to discipline himself in terms of all the *sikkhpada* which were being recited fortnightly at the Uposatha ceremony and which he said

¹ Vin.IV.142f.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

were over a hundred and fifty in number.¹ It is unmistakably clear that this is one of the first attempts to get rid of some of the monastic regulations which had found a place in the code of the Pātimokkha. According to the Suttavibhaṅga this move was headed by the Chabbaggiya monks and their followers who in the history of the Sāsana had gained a fair degree of notoriety by their self-willed actions.² Even if one would attempt to dismiss this gang as a fictitious group, they are no doubt symbolic of the rebels in the Sāsana who were unworthy of their monastic garb and were a constant cause of irritation both to the good monks and the laymen.

This same tendency of the miscreants to resist correction by fellow members of the monastic community in terms of the regulations of the Pātimokkha is also clearly evident in Saṅghādisesa 12.³ These two *sikkhāpada* (Saṅghādisesa 12 and Pācittiya 72) are clear proof of a two-pronged attack launched by the champions of lawlessness and anarchy. Rules of propriety and good behaviour which require conformity to fixed standards are either to be rejected or, on a policy of 'strict

¹ A.I.230.

² Vin.IV.142f. Pācittiya 72.

³ Ibid.III.77f.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

non-interference ', the offenders who violate these regulations are not to be questioned. But the Buddha was not to be led into believing in the sincerity or the correctness of such suggestions and we see him legislate against them with firm determination. Any monk who challenges the right of other Bhikkhus to offer counsel in terms of the regulations of the Pātimokkha and who stubbornly offers resistance does so under the pain of a Saṅghādisesa.¹ No monk shall also speak of the regulations of the Pātimokkha in a disparaging manner, referring to their recital as being of no consequence.²

It is important to recognise the fact that there seems to have existed even during the time of the Buddha a category of *sikkhāpada* which carried the designation 'lesser and minor' or *khuddānukhuddaka*. It is reasonable to believe that the inviolable rules of the Pārājika group would have been in a class by themselves in marked contrast to the rest. No remedy or redress was possible with the offenders of this category. This is perhaps why the Vinaya makes special mention that every monk, on being conferred the higher status of Upasampadā, should be told of these four inviolable rules: *anujānāmi*

¹ Ibid.178

² Ibid.IV.43

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

bhikkhave upasampādetvā dutiyaṃ dātuṃ cattāri ca akaraṇīyāni ācikkhituṃ. in.I.96. Hence the four Pārājikas would naturally form the group of major rules. The Aṅguttara makes repeated reference to a group of 'lesser and minor' rules. These are regarded as being a part of the disciplinary code of the monk. These deal with offences of which any monk could be guilty but for which he could make amends and be absolved therefrom. For they are not declared to be inviolable (*So yāni tāni khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni tāni āpajjati'pi vuṭṭhāti'pi. Taṃ kissa hetu. Na hi m'ettha bhikkhave abhabbatā vuttā.* A.1.231f.). Besides these, the Aṅguttara mentions another set of *sikkhāpada* which have to be inviolably perfected. They would therefore naturally be regarded as the only major ones (*Yāni kho tāni sikkhāpadāni ādibrahmacariyikāni brahmacariyasāruppāni tattha dhuvasīlo ca hoti thitasīlo ca samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu.* A.I. 231ff.)¹

¹ In spite of the diversity of opinion which existed regarding the identity of the *khuddānukhuddaka sikkhāpada*, the followers of the Aṅguttara tradition seems to have maintained this division up to the time of Buddhaghosa. Note: *Imaṃ pana*

aṅguttaramahānikāyavalañjanakācariyā cattāri pārājikāni thapetvā sesāni sabbāni'pi khuddānukhuddakānī'ti vadanti. AA.II.348. See

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

The distinction between the major and the minor rules thus seems to be a valid one. As Pārājika or Akaraṇīya these major items of discipline are the primary requirements without which the monastic life in Buddhism could not be contemplated. Hence they are called *ādibrahmacariyikāni*. However, this does not amount to a denial of the validity of the other group of *sikkhāpada* which are called 'lesser and minor' or *khuddā-nukhuddaka*. On the other hand, the need to regulate the life of a monk in terms of those regulations is fully recognised. For along with the possibility that a monk may violate any one of these rules is also mentioned the possibility of his absolution from the consequent guilt through correction: *āpajjati'pi vutthāti'pi*. Hence a disciple has to face them and adjust himself accordingly and not attempt stubbornly to resist them. This accords well with the spirit of Pācittiya 72 which, though negatively, recognises the usefulness of the recital of even the minor rules at the Pātimokkha ritual.

However, the rebellious monks too, appear to have carried on a ceaseless campaign to achieve their end. Their propaganda for the abolition of the 'lesser and minor' rules was

Vin.II.288 for the diversity of opinion referred to above.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

evidently gaining more and more ground towards the last days of the Buddha. The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta opens, more or less, with the Buddha's advice to his disciples regarding the conditions which lead to their progress and well-being. Under these *aparihāniya dhamma* the Buddha includes what he appears to consider to be the healthy attitude of the disciples towards the regulations governing their monastic life (*Yāvakīvañca bhikkhave bhikkhū apaññattaṃ na paññāpessanti paññattaṃ na samucchindissanti yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattissanti vuddhi y'eva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikāṅkhā no parihāni. D.II.77*). This concern of the Buddha for the recognition of the code of monastic discipline as a whole is clearly evident in his remarks to the venerable Upasena Vaṅgantaputta who maintained that nothing should be added to or removed from the codified law, and that one should conduct oneself in accordance with it (*Sādhu sādhu upasena na apaññattaṃ paññāpetabbaṃ paññattaṃ vā na samucchinditabbaṃ yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattitabbaṃ. Vin.III.231*).

As the Buddha finally lay in his deathbed, during the last moments of his life, it is said that the Buddha indicated to Ānanda that as he had not chosen to appoint an heir to

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

succeed him as the leader of the Sāsana, the Dhamma and the Vinaya would succeed him as their guide (satthā).¹ The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta which records this statement has also three other last-minute communications of the Buddha to the Saṅgha. Among them we discover a very abrupt and unpreluded suggestion which is ascribed to the Buddha. The Buddha is said to have told Ānanda that the Saṅgha, if it so desires, may on his death do away with 'lesser and minor' rules (Ākaṅkhamāno ānanda saṅgho mamaccayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhanatu.. D.II.154).

In the light of what we have discussed so far regarding the history of the *khuddānukhuddaka sikkhāpada* in monastic discipline this appears to be a very strange suggestion. It is almost incredible that a person of the Buddha's calibre should have conceded such a laxity to be effective only after his death. We cannot understand it either as an expression of the wisdom of his last days or as an attempt to wash his hands of the guilt of a possible catastrophe in the monastic order as a result of the abolition of some of the rules of discipline. Before we proceed to examine the historical significance of these

¹ D.II.154: *Yo vo ānanda mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito paññatto so vo mam'accayena satthā.*

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

statements which are recorded in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta it should be pointed out that in the Pañcasatikakkhandhaka of the Cullavagga we find the venerable Ānanda reporting to the assembly of the First Council two out of these four statements.¹ After reciting the contents of the Dhamma before the assembly he places before them `the suggestion of the Buddha that the Saṅgha may, if it so desires, do away with the 'lesser and minor' rules. He is promptly asked by the members of the Saṅgha whether he ascertained from the Buddha the identity of these `lesser and minor' rules. He had failed to do so and when he is found fault with for this omission he simply confesses that it did not occur to him that he should do so (*Ahaṃ kho bhante asatiyā bhagavantam na pucchim.* Vin.II.289). According to the Cullavagga, diverse opinions are thereupon expressed by the members of the assembly as to what constitute the `lesser and minor' rules. But when we discover that reference to `lesser and minor' rules has already been made elsewhere with a fair degree of certainty as to their identity,² it becomes somewhat difficult to explain this assumed ignorance or the diversity of opinion regarding this matter.

¹ Vin.II.287, 290. See also D.II.154

² A.I.231ff.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

Assuming that at least a section of the Saṅgha was agreed on the abolition of the 'lesser and minor' rules and was anxious about it we could argue that even they would have been hesitant to support the abolition of these rules in their entirety as they would have been understood at the time. Some of those rules were certainly regarded as sufficiently important to command recognition throughout the history of the Sāsana. That being so the real question would have been as to which of these 'lesser and minor' rules could, in course of time, be dispensed with. As the arguments of the venerable Mahā Kassapa at the First Council show this would have been undoubtedly a question which few would have dared to answer in public for fear of serious repercussions among the laity (*Sant'amhākaṃ sikkhāpadāni gihigatāni gihī pi no jānanti idaṃ vo samaṇānaṃ sakyaputiyānaṃ kappati idaṃ vo na kappatī'ti. Sace mayaṃ khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhanissāma bhavissanti vattāro dhūmakālikaṃ samaṇena gotamena sāvakānaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ paññattaṃ yāv'imesaṃ satthā aṭṭhāsi tāv'ime sikkhāpadesu sikkhiṃsu. Yato imesaṃ satthā parinibbuto na'dān'i me sikkhā-padesu sikkhantī'ti. Vin.II.288).*

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

Let us now examine the statement recorded in the Theriya tradition that the Buddha did tell Ānanda that the Saṅgha, after his death, could do away with the 'lesser and minor' rules if it so desired.¹ In both places where this statement occurs it is Ānanda himself who states that the Buddha told him so. A comparative study we made of the Chinese versions which are parallel to the Pali Vinaya account has yielded us some valuable evidence. In the Sarvāstivāda,² Mahīśāsaka³, and Dharmaguptaka⁴ accounts, as in the Pali text, Ānanda himself reports that the Buddha made this suggestion. In all the three Chinese texts Ānanda gives the deteriorating physical condition of the Buddha in his deathbed and the consequent pain which he was suffering as an excuse for not interrogating him further regarding the identity of these rules. In the Sarvāstivāda and Mahīśāsaka accounts he gives the high regard in which he held the *sikkhāpada* as another reason for not pursuing this matter any further. This makes it quite clear that Ānanda did not obviously belong to the camp which championed this move.

¹ D.II.154 and Vin.II.287

² *Taisho*, Vol.23.p.449 B

³ *Ibid.* Vol.22.p.191 B

⁴ *Ibid.*p.967 B

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

The texts of the Sarvāstivādins and the Mahīśāsakas represent Ānanda as being reluctant to sponsor such a move. Thus we are more or less compelled to observe that we detect here the results of an attempt to make a cat's paw of Ānanda in this manoeuvre. What we would consider to be the most convincing evidence for this assumption comes to us from the Mahāsaṅghika version of this incident in the Chinese texts.¹ Strangely enough the Mahāsaṅghikas do not present Ānanda as conveying this information to the Saṅgha himself. In fact, he appears to know nothing about it and plays a perfectly silent role throughout this episode. He suffers it all in silence for it is the others who seem to know and talk about the task which is said to have been assigned to him.

Feeling diffident as it were, even with the authority which the Buddha is supposed to have given them to abolish the 'lesser and minor' rules, the Mahāsaṅghikas make an attempt to say in a convincing manner that the Buddha had planned to do it himself before his death. But now it is Ānanda's responsibility that it did not happen so, for he had been asked by the Buddha to remind him about it before his death and he failed to do it.

¹ *Taisho*, Vol.22.p.492 B-C.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

The following is the statement in the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya in the Chinese versions:

'Upāli tells the assembly: "The Buddha told Ānanda thus. `When I am about to enter into Nirvāṇa you should remind me so that I may repeal for the sake of the Bhikṣus the minor and insignificant rules.' But you did not tell him." ¹

The Mahāsaṅghika account carries a further statement which attempts to reinforce this idea.

There is a Bhikṣu who says: "Venerable Sirs, the Tathāgata earlier told Ānanda that he was desirous of repealing the minor and insignificant rules for the Bhikṣus." ²

Now we come to what may be regarded as the most significant statement of all in the Mahāsaṅghika account. In the discussion that followed the announcement about the abolition of `lesser and minor' rules there was diversity of opinion as to their identity, and the congregation was drifting further and further away from any finality of decision. In the Mahāsaṅghika

¹ Ibid.p.492 B

² Ibid.p.492 C

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

account alone we discover that at this stage the Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus were most dismayed at the failure to implement this suggestion. It was obviously their cause which was being defeated. In an attempt to rescue it from this plight the Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus darted forth to announce in the assembly that if the Buddha were living all the rules would have been given up.¹

In view of the marked divergence in the traditions of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theravādins on this matter let us probe further to discover the loyalties and leanings of each group. In the Mahāsaṅghika account, when the venerable Mahā Kassapa asks the assembly as to which collection of scriptures they should recite first it is the unanimous opinion of the Saṅgha that it should be the Dharma Piṭaka.² We know that this is completely at variance with the Theriya tradition which seems to emphasise more the importance of the Vinaya. Considering the attempts made by them to safeguard the proper maintenance of monastic discipline at all stages in the history of the Sāsana it could unhesitatingly be said of them that they had a very high regard for the Vinaya. What Buddhaghosa records as having

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid. p.491 B-C.

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

been said at the First Council that the Vinaya is the life-blood of the Sāsana (*vinayo nāma buddhasāsanassa āyu*) is reminiscent of this attitude.¹ Thus we see a very clear line of division between these two groups.

One would hardly be surprised to find among the Mahāsaṅghikas a tendency to bring about a laxity in monastic discipline. It accords well with what is alleged to be their attitude to the Vinaya.² The account in their Vinaya texts which we have discussed above shows the ingenuity with which they introduce the story which discloses the wish of the Buddha to repeal the minor rules himself. On the other hand, one does feel that this alleged suggestion by the Buddha to repeal the minor rules strikes a harsh and discordant note in the Theriya tradition. It is perhaps this unacceptability to the orthodox tradition which made it to be brought up as a dilemmatic problem by King Milinda before the venerable Nāgasena. `Were then these lesser and minor precepts wrongly laid down, or established in

¹ VinA.I.13

² It is said that the Mahāsaṅghikas branched off from the parent Theriya tradition after the ten disputed points of Vinaya which they put forward had been rejected by the orthodox Theriya group. See *Dīpavaṃsa*, Ed. Oldenberg. p.36

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

ignorance and without due cause, that the Blessed One allowed them to be revoked after his death ?'¹ (*Kin nu kho bhante nāgasena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni duppaññattāni udāhu avatthusmiṃ ajānitvā paññattāni yaṃ bhagavā attano accayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhanāpeti.* Trenckner, *Milindapañho*, p.142).

The problem that is posed here is if the Buddha wished these rules to be revoked after his death then they cannot really be important rules which were laid down after careful consideration. On the other hand, if they were really such important rules he could not possibly allow the Bhikkhus to revoke them after his death. Nāgasena attempts to solve the problem by admitting both propositions. i.e. that the rules were well laid down and that the Buddha had ordered the Bhikkhus to revoke them if they so desired. But Nāgasena adds that this order of the Buddha was only to test his disciples. `But in the second case it was to test the Bhikkhus that he said it, to try whether, if leave were granted them, they would, after his death, revoke the lesser and minor regulations, or still adhere to them.'² (*Taṃ pana mahārāja tathāgato bhikkhū vīmaṃsamāno*

¹ Rhys Davids, *The Questions of King Milinda*, Part I. [SBE.35] p.202

² *Loc.cit.*

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

āha ukkalissanti nu kho mama sāvaka mayā vissajjāpiyamānā mam'accayena khuddā-nukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni udāhu ādiyissantī'ti. Miln.143).

It is clear from the above statements that the venerable Nāgasena is of the view that an abolition of any rule laid down by the Buddha for the guidance of his disciples does not accord with the true Theriya tradition. We find that Buddhaghosa reiterates the same. He says that the Buddha himself knew that even if he had made a specific order for the abolition of the lesser and minor rules, without leaving it to the option of the Saṅgha, the venerable Mahā Kassapa would not abolish them at the time of the first Council (*Passati hi bhagavā samūhanathā'ti vutte'pi saṅgītikāle kassapo na samūhanissati 'ti. Tasmā vikappena eva thapesi.* DA.II.592). Therefore the Buddha left it to the option of the Saṅgha.

Following the statements of the venerable Nāgasena in the Milindapañha if we take this suggestion for the abolition of the lesser and minor rules to be a test of the attitude of the disciples who survived the Buddha, then we would discover to our utter dismay that none, perhaps other than the venerable Mahā Kassapa, would show themselves to be true disciples of the Buddha. For not only were the members of the First Council

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

quick to chastise Ānanda for not ascertaining from the Buddha the identity of the rules which they may revoke but also were quick to propose the abolition of various categories of rules. Not one, out of respect for the law laid down by the Buddha, proposed its acceptance *in toto*. It was the venerable Mahā Kassapa who, as the President of the Council, finally proposed that the suggestion for the abolition of the lesser and minor rules be rejected and that the law as laid down by the Buddha be accepted *in toto*.

However, there seems to be a post-Milindapañha tradition which, more or less, stigmatizes the venerable Mahā Kassapa saying that he did so because he was ignorant as to what the lesser and minor rules were. It praises, on the other hand, the venerable Nāgasena who very categorically identifies *khuddaka* and *anukhuddaka* with *Dukkaṭa* and *Dubhāsita* respectively.¹ This interpretation of Nāgasena, it would appear, could absolve to some extent those who championed the abolition of the *khuddānukhuddaka sikkhāpada* from the charge of being unorthodox. For they would not then be directing their assault against any real *sikkhāpada* except the Sekhiyas violation of

¹ DA.II.592f. See also Miln.144

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

which also constitute Dukkaṭa offences. Barring this group of Dukkaṭas, both Dukkaṭa and Dubbhāsita are derivative offences and are not the direct outcome of the violation of any *sikkhāpada*. But Buddhaghosa warns us against taking the words of Nāgasena to serve as a defence. We are told that he was only being tactful in his conversation with non-believers (*Nāgasena-tthero hi paravādino okāso mā ahoṣīti evaṃ āha*. DA.II.593).

Thus we feel that even among the followers of the Theriya tradition certain sections seem to have supported the suggestion for the abolition of the lesser and minor rules and at times even frowned on the stalwarts of the Theriya group who upheld the orthodox views. However, this suggestion, when placed in the context of the Theriya Vinaya traditions, sounds unmistakably to be of Chabbaggiya origin, for the Chabbaggiyas as we have shown, on the evidence of both the Theriya and Mahāsaṅghika records, have always been the symbol of the dissentients.

This brings us to yet another problem. How did such a statement which does not accord with the traditions of the Theriya school come to be recorded in their literature? In

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

answer to this we would commend the following points for consideration.

1. The first observations to be made on this is the fact that the two works in which this statement is recorded, viz. the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta and the Saṅgītikkhanda of the Cullavagga, both belong to a relatively later stratum in the Canonical Pali literature.
2. The two Khandhakas of the Cullavagga which deal with the two Saṅgīti are both in point of time and contents relatively outside the scope of the Vinaya Piṭaka.
3. The Cullavagga account of the first Saṅgīti includes besides this statement on the abolition of the lesser and minor rules another statement which records a dissent and is not wholly favourable to the Theriya tradition. This is the refusal of the venerable Purāṇa to accord fully with the recital of the Dhamma and the Vinaya which the monks of the Theriya group had carried out in his absence.¹

¹ Vin.II.290

Appendix II - The Abolition of the Lesser and Minor Rules of Training

4. Even the Khandhakas show traces of the presence of traditions which at times appear to be far removed from the original spirit of the Vinaya. These become very glaring when the older tradition happens to be preserved intact, at times, in the Vinaya texts of other schools. This points to the fact that the stratification of the contents of the Khandhakas did spread over a period of time which was long enough to allow the adoption of discordant traditions either out of choice or under pressure from within or without. Unlike the Suttavibhaṅga, the nature of the contents of the Khandhakas also would have made this process of assimilation possible.

APPENDIX III

The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

While the purity and the prestige of the early Buddhist Saṅgha was being safeguarded by the regular performance of the Pātimokkha ritual, the Mahāvagga witnesses certain sections of the community of monks who were holding factional meetings for the purpose of reciting the Pātimokkha within their own groups (*Tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū yathāparisāya pātimokkhaṃ uddisanti sakāya sakāya parisāya.* Vin.I.104). This would certainly have been in violation of the spirit in which the ritual was instituted in the early days of the Sāsana.¹ Legislating against such a situation which would herald the disintergration of the Saṅgha, the Buddha declares it to be a Dukkaṭa offence and calls for unity of the Saṅgha in the performance of the Uposatha.

But considering the increasing membership of the corporation of the Saṅgha and the vastness of the territory over which it was spreading, there seems to have appeared the

¹ M.II.8; III.10

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

need to determine as to what would be a convenient unit for the collective activities of the Saṅgha. We notice in the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta that the village in which the monks lived had served as the unit of such monastic activities.¹ When the Buddha insisted on the unity of the Saṅgha in their monastic activities, the monks seem to have been perplexed by the theoretical position whether the unity of the Saṅgha implied the inclusion of all members of the community living in the land, literally on earth: *Kittāvatā nu kho sāmaggī hoti yāvatā ekāvāso udāhu sabbā paṭhavīti.* Vin.I.105. This, we have no doubt, was hardly meant to be taken as a real position and would have been recorded here more for the purpose of pointing out the relevance of practical considerations. An area of residence (*ekāvāso*) became the obvious choice as an operational unit and on the recommendation of the Buddha the area of residence is delimited by boundaries, accepted and agreed upon by the Saṅgha as the region of co-residence within which the Saṅgha was expected to perform its activities collectively: *Sammata sīmā saṅghena etehi nimittehi samānasaṃvāsā ekūposathā.* Ibid.106. This marks the birth of Sīmā in Buddhist monastic history.

¹ Ibid.III.10

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

It is clear from the evidence of the Mahāvagga that in the early days of the Buddhist community not all *āvāsa* or centres of monastic residence enjoyed the status of being Sīmā or independent units of monastic activity. *Ekāvāsa* meant a region of residence within which all members acted collectively as one single body (*saṅgha*). The Samantapāsādikā portrays beautifully this state of affairs in the early history of the Sāsana when it says that the eighteen great monasteries in the vicinity of Rājagaha formed collectively a single unit of common communal activity. (*Rājagahaṃ hi parikkhipitvā aṭṭhārasa mahāvihārā sabbe ekasīmā. Dhammasenāpatinā nesaṃ sīmā baddhā. Tasmā veḷuvane saṅghassa sāmaggidānatthaṃ āgacchanto'ti attho.* VinA.V.1049). Any one of the *āvāsa* within the region may turn out to be, by the choice of the Saṅgha, the venue of the ritual of the Uposatha (*Tena kho pana samayena rājagahe sambahulā āvāsā samānasīmā honti. Tattha bhikkhū vivadanti amhākaṃ āvāse uposatho karīyatu amhākaṃ āvāse uposatho karīyatū'ti.* Vin.I.108). We hear of members of one *āvāsa* going to another as guests for the purpose of performing the Uposatha there. (*Āgantukā bhikkhū na jānanti kattha vā ajj'uposatho karīyissatī'ti.* Ibid.107). Thus it was possible for the inmates of many *āvāsa* to operate as members of one Sīmā in their activities.

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

In performing the ritual of the Uposatha the monks had to operate collectively and no sectional meetings were allowed within that region (*Tehi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi sabbeh'eva ekajjhaṃ sannipatitvā uposatho kātabbo. Yattha vā pana thero bhikkhu viharati tattha sannipatitvā uposatho kātabbo. Na tv'eva vaggena saṅghena uposatho kātabbo.* Ibid.108). All monks living within it, heedless of the distance they had to travel and the hardships of the journey, congregated at an appointed place for the purpose of the Pātimokkha recital. In the interests of the guest monks it was considered necessary to decide before hand upon a site for the performance of the ritual, viz. an *uposathāgāra*. Thus, on account of the prior knowledge of the place, the participants would be enabled to arrive there in time without any confusion. The Saṅgha may choose for this purpose any one of the five buildings sanctioned for monastic residence.¹ Once selected an *uposathāgāra* continued to be recognised as such until the decision is revoked by the Saṅgha. It is clear from the following statement about the thoughtless selection of two such buildings at the same site and the subsequent order made by the Buddha to cancel one and use the other (*Tena kho pana samayena aññatarasmim āvāse dve*

¹ Vin.I.56

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

uposathāgārāni sammatāni honti ... Anujānāmi bhikkhave ekaṃ samūhanivā ekattha uposathaṃ kātuṃ. Vin.I.107). In case the *uposathāgāra* turns out to be too small for the congregation which assembles, then the Saṅgha is empowered to declare as much of the courtyard of the building (*uposathapamukha*) as necessary to be valid territory in which the participants may take their seats for the ritual of the Pātimokkha. This is clearly a matter of ritualistic detail quite additional to the early spirit of the Pātimokkha recital. For it is said with reference to an incident which historically takes precedence over this that the ritualistic validity of the ground on which a monk sat during the Pātimokkha recital was a matter of no concern as long as he was able to hear from there the Pātimokkha as it was being recited (*Sammatāya vā bhikkhave bhūmiyā nisinnā asammatāya vā yato pātimokkhaṃ suṇāti kato'v'assa uposatho.* Ibid.108).

Although the delimitation of a region of Sīmā was approved, Sīmā in its early stages was not subjected to restrictions of size. Some of them became very large extending up to four, five and six *yojana*. The monks who had to travel long distances to the venue of the recital were unable to arrive in time. Hence three *yojana* soon came to be fixed as the maximum allowable size of

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

a Sīmā. No Sīmā was also to extend beyond a river unless there was a permanent bridge or a regular ferry providing a safe crossing.¹ The incidents connected with this proviso make it clear that it is based on practical considerations and has no ritualistic significance whatsoever.

Based on this institution of Sīmā which is thus established by delimitation of a specified region to be a unit of co-residence and common Uposatha, the members of the Saṅgha are given a concession to set apart one of their three robes for safe keeping, as a stand-by to be used in case of damage to the others. This legislation was actually provoked by the incident in which the venerable Mahā Kassapa who on his way from Andhakavinda to participate in the Uposatha at Rājagaha got his robes wet while crossing a river and had to attend the ritual in his wet robes for want of a change of clothing. This concession of keeping out of one 's possession one out of the unit of three robes (*ticīvarena avippavāsasammutī*) is applicable within the aforesaid Samāna-saṃvāsaka-sīmā, but leaving out its urban areas,² for it is out side these that this concession

¹ Ibid.106.

² This interpretation is supported by the Samantapāsādikā which takes *niḡama*, *nagara* and *gāma* to be all in the same category: *Ettha ca*

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

would have been most needed. (*Yā sā bhikkhave saṅghena sīmā sammatā samānasamvāsā ekuposathā saṅgho taṃ sīmaṃ ticivarena avippavāsaṃ sammanatu ṭhapetvā gāmañ ca gāmūpacārañ ca*. Vin.I.109).

The Mahāvagga also makes provision for regions in which monks reside but wherein no Sīmā has been officially proclaimed. In the case of such towns and villages (*gāmagahaṇena c'ettha nagaram pi gahitaṃ eva hoti*. VinA.V.1051) their own boundaries are accepted to circumscribe the area of co-residence for the monks (*Asammatāya bhikkhave sīmāya yaṃ gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā upanissāya viharati yā tassa vā gāmassa gāmasīmā nigamassa vā nigamasīmā ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ek'uposathā*. Vin.I.110 f.). This seems to reflect the conditions which are referred to in the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta and are perhaps

nigamanagarānam'pi gāmen'eva saṅgaho veditabbo. VinA.V.1050.

PTS Dictionary equates *gāmantavihārī* to *āraññaka*. This is obviously a mistaken identification, for the two terms are regularly used in antithesis as is clearly seen from the following example:

Āraññakenā'pi kho āvuso moggallāna bhikkhunā ime dhammā samādāya vattitabbā pageva gāmantavihārīnā'ti. M.I.273.

See also M.I.30f. See *supra* p.7.

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

characteristic of a stage of pre-sīmā antiquity (*Te mayam tad'ah'uposathe yāvatikā ekaṃ gāmakkhetaṃ upanissāya viharāma te sabbe ekajjhaṃ sannipatāma*. M.III. 10).

To this group of unbounded Sīmā of *gāma* and *nigama* is also added the forest regions in which monks reside. From any such place of residence an area of a radius of *sattabbhantara*, i.e. seven *abbhantara*¹ is marked out as the region of *samānasamvāsa* and *ekuposatha* (*Agāmake ce bhikkhave araññe samantā sattabbhantarā ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ekuposathā*. Vin.I.111). Such a Sattabbhantara Sīmā enjoys also the privilege of *ticīvaravippavāsaparihāra* (*ticīvarena avippavāssasammuti*).² The Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta perhaps portrays an earlier phase of monastic life when it says that even the forest-dwelling monks come regularly to the midst of the Saṅgha for the recital of the Pātimokkha.³ In course of time further independent units of monastic residence seem to appear as the community expands and spreads over wider territories.

¹ The Samantapāsādikā defines an *abbhantara* as being twenty-eight cubits in length. See VinA.V.1052

² VinA.V.1052

³ M.II.8

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

As a result of this we also note a corresponding change in the concept of Sīmā.

Sīmā, which originally indicated a practical and convenient unit of residence of the Saṅgha for their common communal activities (*samānasaṃvāsā ekuposathā*) and referred to as Samānasaṃvāsaka Sīmā, seems to have soon changed its character to mean also the venue in which the Saṅgha may perform its monastic activities like the conferment of Pabbajjā and Upasampadā. This gives rise to what is latterly known as the Khaṇḍa Sīmā. The Samantapāsādikā suggests that this smaller unit of Khaṇḍa Sīmā should, in fact, be established first before the establishment of the Samānasaṃvāsaka Sīmā (*Imaṃ pana samānasaṃvāsakasīmaṃ sammannantehi pabbajjupasampadādīnaṃ saṅghakammānaṃ sukhakaraṇatthaṃ paṭhamam khaṇḍasīmāyo bandhitabbā. Vin.A.V.1041*).

In a monastic residence which is complete with all its accessories like the Bodhi tree, Cetiya and the Alms-hall, the Khaṇḍa Sīmā should be located in a quiet corner [not in the centre of the monastic residence] at a place which is not frequented by many people (*Sace hi bodhi-cetiya-bhattachasālādīni sabbavatthūni patittḥāpetvā katavihāre bandhanti vihāramajjhe*

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

bahūnaṃ samosaraṇaṭṭhāne abandhitvā vihārapaccante vivittokāse bandhitabbā. Ibid.). Considering the quorum for valid monastic acts (which range from four to twenty monks), it is said that the Khaṇḍa Sīmā should be large enough to accommodate not less than twenty-one monks (*Sā heṭṭhiamparicchedena sace ekavīsati bhikkhū gaṇhāti vaṭṭati tato oraṃ na vaṭṭati ...* Ibid.). It is also conceded that a large monastery could have as many as two, three or more Khaṇḍa Sīmā (*Sace pana vihāro mahā hoti dve'pi tisso'pi tad'uttari'pi khaṇḍasīmāyo bandhitabbā.* Ibid.1042).

Any watery abode like a river, natural lake or the sea is said to be, by its very nature, suitable for the performance of all monastic acts. 'Its very nature' here may mean the fact that such places being 'uninhabited' it requires no further legislation to exclude aliens. Here, under normal circumstances, there would be no danger of trespassers (*Sā pana attano sabhāven'eva baddhasīmāsadisā. Sabbam ettha saṅghakammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭati. Samuddajātassaresu'pi es'eva nayo.* VinA.V.1052). Thus we see the emergence of the Udakukkhepa Sīmā. It is a region in a river, a natural lake or the sea which covers `the distance that a man of average (height)

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

can throw water all round.¹ (*Nadiyā vā bhikkhave samudde vā jātassare vā yaṃ majjhimassa purisassa samantā udak'ukkhepā ayaṃ tattha samānasaṃvāsā ekuposathā.* Vin.I.111).

The Mahāvagga itself gives indications of a steady elaboration of the concept of Sīmā. What was originally introduced for the convenient administration of the monastic community soon turns out to be a cause of dispute in itself. With the fragmentation of the central Sīmā and the consequent multiplicity of smaller units there arose the danger of some of them overlapping the others (*Tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū sīmāya sīmaṃ sambhindanti.* Vin.I.111. Also: *Tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū sīmāya sīmaṃ ajjhottharanti.* Ibid.). To avoid such overlapping of territory of each monastic group it soon became necessary to provide a 'buffer state' (*sīmantarikā*) between two regions which are marked out as Sīmā (*Anujānāmi bhikkhave sīmaṃ sammannantena sīmantarikaṃ thapetvā sīmaṃ sammannitum..* Ibid.).

¹ See *The Book of the Discipline* IV. p.145

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

This ritualistic concern with which the validity of each Sīmā seems to have been guarded appears to have been a subject of absorbing interest in the history of the Sāsana. This would have been necessarily so as the authority for the enforcement of discipline in Buddhist monastic life had to be secured at an impersonal level through the validity of monastic procedure. Sīmā undoubtedly was the corner-stone of this structure. The Khandhakas have already witnessed the interest shown in it. The Samantapāsādikā shows how it has proceeded so far as to produce divergent views on many issues according to the inclinations of the diverse groups that developed within the Theriya fold.¹

The wealth of Vinaya literature written in Ceylon in Pali on the theme of Sīmā shows what a live problem it had turned out to be even after the authoritative commentarial notes of Buddhaghosa on this subject. A Ceylonese thera by the name of Vācissasra is said to have compiled the Sīmālaṅkāra in the 13th century. The Buddhist monastic community of Burma seems to have been equally interested in this problem. The Burmese thera Chapaṭa compiled a Tīkā to the Sīmālaṅkāra of

¹ See VinA.V.1053, 1055, 1056

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

Vācissara.¹ Of this work, Mabel Bode says: `The Sīmālaṅkārapakaraṇa of Chapaṭa was a result of the Talaing therā's studies in Ceylon.² A considerable amount of literary activity on this subject seems to have gone on in both countries, perhaps with mutual influence.³ Another treatise compiled in Ceylon similar to the Sīmālaṅkāra of Vācissara is the Sīmāsaṅkarachedanī of Srī Rāhula (15th century).⁴

The importance attached to the ritualistic validity of Sīmā does not appear to have been peculiar only to the Southern schools of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma and Ceylon. It does seem to have been shared by some of the schools of Buddhism in the Far East as well. The Kaidan (the equivalent of Sīmā in the Far East) must have enjoyed some prestige in China and Japan at a very early date. Kanjin (Chien-chen in Chinese pronunciation) who introduced the Vinaya or Ritsu sect (= Lū-tsung of China) from China to Japan built a Kaidan for

¹ Malalasekera, *Pali Literature of Ceylon*, p.202

² Bode, *Pali Literature of Burma*, p.39.n.1.

³ See Taw Sein Ko's *Preliminary Study of the Kalyāni Inscriptions of Dhammaceti*. 1476 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.* xxii, p.11f.).

⁴ Malalasekera, *op.cit.* p.251

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

performing the ceremony of admission to the Order.¹ What is more important here is the point which stresses the ritualistic significance of this new establishment. Monks and nuns of the land who had already been ordained but whose admission to the Order was considered invalid for any reason were re-ordained by him. After many entreaties by Dengyo Daishi, the founder of the Tendai sect in Japan, another Kaidan was established at Hieizan in 827 A.D. This seems to have led to the decline of the fortunes of the Ritsu sect. However in the 12th century, Shosho shonin, in a bid to revive the Ritsu sect, wrote a treatise called Kaidan Shiki on the ceremonial to be observed at ordinations.² Nevertheless, we have no doubt that with the birth of new and rival sects the Kaidan probably had to face a competitive process of change and modification.

The history of Buddhist monasticism in Ceylon has also witnessed a major dispute regarding the validity of a Sīmā which was being used for the conferment of Upasampadā. It assumed such proportions that Burma too, was drawn into it. Its history in brief is as follows.³ In 1845 A.D. an Udakukkhepa

¹ Kanjin arrived at Nara in Japan in 753 A.D.

² See Sir Charles Eliot, Japanese Buddhism, p.231f.

³ The statements within inverted commas which are reproduced above

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

Sīmā `consisting of a permanent raft fixed in the middle of the lake called Mādugaṅga at Balapitimodara [in Ceylon / Sri Lanka] and having an approach to it by a bridge from the bank' was established. Sometime afterwards, `a famous learned priest called Laṅkāgoda Sirisaddhammavaṃsapāla Dhīrānanda' found fault with it `as being confused and undetached, and consequently irregular and invalid ... In consequence of his representations and his protest against the validity of the rite of ordination performed in the said Sīmā many priests who had received that rite there had themselves re-ordained in properly defined Sīmās ... There were, on the other hand, several who from various motives upheld the validity of that Sīmā and the ecclesiastical acts performed therein: thus disputes and dissensions arose in the Society and rent the unity and harmony which had hitherto prevailed.'

are extracts from the English summary of the introduction to the Sīmānayadappana of Dhammālaṅkāra Thera (published 1885 A.D.). This treatise, as would be clear from the notes above, was in support of the charge that the Sīmā at Balapitimodara in Ceylon was ritualistically invalid and it attempts to meet the arguments of the Sīmālakṅhanadīpanī of Vimalasāra Thera which was written in defence of the said Sīmā. (Published 1881 A.D.).

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

At this time two Ceylonese priests named Dhammakhandha and Vanaratana went on a visit to Burma and informed the High Priest (Saṅgha Rāja) of Mandalay about the controversy that was raging in Ceylon with respect to the validity of the Balapitimodara Sīmā in which the ordination of the Amarapura priests had been hitherto held ... This pontiff (Saṅgha Rāja) having learnt the particulars of the case and after consulting the most eminent members of the Buddhist clergy in that country, drew up a memorandum embodying their decision on the matters in dispute, and sent the document in charge of these priests to the address of the principal priests of the Amarapura Society in Ceylon. This authoritative decision which was adverse to the views held by those who maintained the validity of the aforesaid Sīmā not having been accepted as conclusive by them, the Saṅgha Rāja of Burma sent a second epistle supporting the statements made in the first with the help of copious quotations from the Pali texts and commentaries, and exhorting the recalcitrant priests to yield to reason and authority.

When this epistle was read in a public assembly of the Buddhist clergy and laity, the then High Priest of the Amarapura Society and his colleagues who, for some time, upheld the

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

vailidity of the disputed Sīmā became convinced of its faultiness and renouncing their preconceived notions on the subject joined the party of Lan̄kāgoda. A number of priests at Dodanduwa who stood aloof from the contending factions also gave in its adherence on this day to the united factions, and thenceforward the three parties in alliance performed their ecclesiastical functions together in peace and harmony. But this epistle as well as two others accompanied with diagrams on the subject, subsequently addressed to the Amarapura priests of Ceylon by two learned members of the Burmese church, had no effect on those who persisted in their error.

Things were in this state when the priest Vimalasāra Thera of the Ambagahapitiya Vihāra at Velitota, who had received his ordination at the faulty place of consecration, wrote some epistles addressed to the late King of Burma and to the leading ministers and priests of that country, propounding certain questions having reference to the validity or invalidity of the disputed Sīmā at Balapitimodara. The questions submitted by Vimalasāra were, at the instance of the King and his ministers, referred to a Committee of the most learned Buddhist priests of Mandalay under the presidency of the best Vinaya scholar of that country named Sirisaddhammavamsapāla Jāgara Mahā

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

Thera. This Committee embodied their opinions on the different points submitted to them in the form of a report, which was printed and published in Burma, and copies of it were sent to Ceylon for distribution among the priests here. The decision arrived at by this learned Committee was again adverse to the opinions of Vimalasāra and his party, and the Sīmā at Balapitimodara was condemned as defective and faulty. One would have supposed that this would settle the whole question and put an end to the controversy and strife once and for ever; but it was not so.....

With the praiseworthy object of conciliating the factious brethren in Ceylon and uniting the Amarapura Society in the bonds of peace and brotherhood, the Committee aforementioned, named Sirisaddhammavamsa Jāgara Mahā Thera, and who had come on a visit here, convened an assembly of the principal priests of Ceylon in order to advise and exhort the oppositionists to yield to reason and discipline. This priest, in a great public assembly held at Velitara exhorted Vimalasāra and his party to stand to reason and to submit to authority; but the oppositionists actuated by policy rather than by wisdom, disregarded the sober admonition.

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

After the great Thera Jāgara left the island, the leader of the oppositionist band, Vimalasāra Thera, printed and published a work entitled Sīmālakkaḥaḍḍipānī in which he attempted to set at naught the generally received opinions of the ancient elders of the church who, in his estimate, were not infallible and were liable to error. This book has been widely circulated among the Amarapura section of the Buddhist clergy both in and out of the island, and its tendency is to perpetuate and widen the breach which has unfortunately occurred among the brethren of the Amarapura clergy.

In order, therefore, to counteract the evil effects which this work is calculated to produce among the laity and clergy, and to correct the errors and misrepresentations which it contains.... we have thought it incumbent upon us to publish a reply to that work by the title of `Sīmānayadappana or A Mirror of the System of Consecrated Boundaries.'

We lament the fact that we are not in a position to produce an equally comprehensive version for the defence from the school of Vimalasāra Thera. However, it is clear that in these two works we come to possess two Vinaya treatises on the question of Sīmā submitted from opposite camps. These two masterly studies of the 19th century, while being undoubtedly a

Appendix III - The Concept of Sīmā: Its Origin and Development

valuable addition to our Vinaya literature, also indicate the changing trends in the history of the Sāsana in the island.

Bibliography

I. ORIGINAL SOURCES

A. Pali Texts and Translations

Āṅguttara Nikāya, Ed. R. Morris and E. Hardy, 5 Vols., PTS. London, 1885 - 900. Tr. F.L.Woodward and E. M. Hare, *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, 5 Vols., PTS. London, 1932 - 36

Āṅguttara Nikāya Commentary, see Manorathapuraṇī.

Apadāna, Ed. M.E.Lilley, 2 Vols., PTS. London, 1925 - 27.

Atthasālinī, Comy. to Dhammasaṅgaṇī, Ed.E.Muller, PTS. London, 1897.

Bhikkhupātimokkhagaṇṭhidīpanī of Nānakitti Mahā Thera, Ed. K.Gunaratna Thera, Colombo, 1889. Printed in Sinhala characters.

Dhammapada, Ed. S.Sumaṅgala Thera, PTS. London, 1914.

Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, Ed. H.C.Norman, 4 Vols., PTS. London, 1906 -14.

Dīgha Nikāya, Ed. T.W.Rhys Davids and J.E.Carpenter, 3 Vols., PTS. London, 1890 -1911. Tr. T.W. and C.A.F.Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, [SBB. Vols. 2, 3 and 4] OUP. London, 1899 - 1921.

Bibliography

Dīgha Nikāya Commentary, see Sumaṅgalavilāsinī.

Jātaka, Ed. V.Fausboll, 6 Vols. and Index, London, 1895 -1907.

Translated in 6 volumes under the editorship of E.B.Cowell.

Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, Buddhaghosa's Comy. to the Pātimokkha (*Mātikā Atthakathā*), Ed. Dorothy Maskell, PTS.London, 1956.

Mahāniddeśa, see Niddeśa.

Majjhima Nikāya, Ed.V.Trenkner and R. Chalmers, 3 Vols., PTS. London, 1948 - 51. Tr. R. Chalmers, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, 2 Vols., PTS. London. 1888. Tr. I.B.Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, 3 Vols., PTS. London, 1954 - 59.

Majjhima Nikāya Commentary, see Papañcasūdanī.

Manorathapuraṇī, Comy. to Aṅguttara Nikāya, Ed. M. Walleser H.Hopp, 5 PTS. London, 1924 - 56.

Milindapañha, Ed. V.Trenkner, London, 1928. Tr. T.W. Rhys Davids, *The Questions of King Milinda* SBE. Vols. 35, 36, Oxford, 1890,1894. Tr. I.B.Horner, *Milinda's Questions*, SBB. Vols. 22, 23, PTS. London, 1963 - 64.

Niddeśa, I - Mahāniddeśa, Ed. L.de la V. Poussin and E.J.Thomas, 2 Vols.; II - Cullaniddeśa, Ed. W.Stede, PTS. London, 1916 -18.

Papañcasūdanī, Comy. to Majjhima Nikāya, Ed. J.H.Woods, D.Kosambi and I.B.Horner, 5 Vols., PTS., London, 1922 - 38.

Paramatthajotikā II, Comy. to Suttanipāta, Ed. H. Smith, 3 Vols. in II, PTS. London, 1916 -18.

Bibliography

- Paṭisambhidāmagga, Ed. A.C.Taylor, PTS. London, 2 Vols., 1905 - 7.
- Samantapāsādikā, Comy. to Vinaya Piṭaka, Ed. J.Takakusu & M.Nagai, PTS. London, 5 Vols., 1924 - 38. Vol. 6, Colombo, 1947.
- Samyutta Nikāya, Ed. L. Feer, 6 Vols., PTS. London, 1884 -1904. Tr. C.A.F.Rhys Davids and F.L.Woodward, *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, 5 Vols., PTS. London 1917-30.
- Samyutta Nikāya Commentary, see Sāratthappakāsinī.
- Sāratthadīpanī, Sāriputta's Comy. (Tīkā) to Samantapāsādikā, Part I. Ed. Bihalpola Devarakkhita Thera (pp.1- 639), 1914; Part II. Ed. Mabopitiye Medhaṅkara Thera (pp. 640-903), 1933. Printed in Ceylon in Sinhala characters.
- Sāratthappakāsinī, Comy. to Samyutta Nikāya, Ed. F.L. Woodward, 3 Vols., PTS.London, 1929 - 37.
- Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, Comy. to Dīgha Nikāya, Ed. T.W.Rhys Davids, J.E.Carpenter and W.Stede. 3 Vols., PTS. London, 1888 -1932.
- Suttanipāta, Ed. D.Anderson and H. Smith, PTS. London,1948. Tr. R.Chalmers, HOS. Vol.37, 1932 Tr. E.M.Hare, Woven Cadences of Early Buddhists, SBB. 15, London, 1945.
- Suttanipāta Commentary, see Paramatthajotikā.
- Thera - and Therīgāthā, Ed. H. Oldenberg and. R. Pischel, PTS. London, 1883. Tr.C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Psalms of the Early Buddhists*, 2 Vols., PTS. London: *Psalms of the Sisters*. First Published 1909. *Psalms of the Brethren*. First Published 1913.

Bibliography

Udāna, Ed. P.Steinthal, PTS. London, 1948. Tr. F.L.Woodward, *The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon* II. Published 1935.

Vibhaṅga, Ed. C.A.F.Rhys Davids, PTS. London, 1904.

Vimativinodanī, Coliya Kassapa's Comy. (Tikā) to Samantapāsādikā, Ed. Beratuduwe Dhammādhāra Tissa Thera, Ceylon, 1935. Printed in Sinhala characters.

Vimuttimagga, Tr. Rev. N.R.M.Ehara, Soma Thera and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom*, Ceylon, 1961.

Vinaya Piṭaka, Ed. H. Oldenberg, 5 Vols., PTS. London, 1879 - 83. Tr. T.W.Rhys Davids and H.Oldenberg, *Vinaya Texts*, SBE.Vols. 13,17, 20, Oxford, 1881- 85. Tr.I.B.Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, SBB.Vols.10,11,13,14 and 20, London, 1949-52.

Vinayavinicchaya, Buddhadatta's Manuals II, Ed. A.P.Buddhadatta Thera, PTS.London, 1928.

Visuddhimagga, by Buddhaghosa, Ed.C.A.F.Rhys Davids, 2 Vols., PTS. London, 1920 - 21. Reprinted in one volume 1975. Tr. Bhikkhu Nānamoli, *The Path of Purification*, Colombo, Ceylon 1956.

B. Prakrit, Sanskrit and Chinese Texts and Translations

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, Ed. R.Roth and W.D.Whitney, Berlin, 1924.

Tr.R.T.H.Griffith, *Hymns of the Atharvaveda*, Vol2. Benares, 1896.

Bibliography

Bhagavadgītā, Ed. S. Radhakrishnan, London, 1948.

Bṛhadāraṅyaka Upaniṣad, with Comy. of ṅaikara, Ed. V.B. Āpte, AAS.15, 4th Edition. 1939.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad, with Comy. of ṅaikara, Ed. V.G.Āpte, AAS. 14, 5th Edition,1934.

Chinese Tripiṅaka, see Taisho Issaikyo.

Dharmaguptaka Vinaya: preserved in Chinese, Taisho Issaikyo.

Gilgit Manuscripts, Ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, 3 Vols. Vol.I; Vol.II, Parts 1,2,3; Vol. III, Pats 1, 2, 3, 4. Srinagar, Kashmir, 1939-50.

Jaina Sūtras, Tr. Hermann Jacobi, SBE.Vols. 22,45, Oxford, 1884,1895.

Kaṅha Upaniṣad, Ed.V.G.Āpte, AAS. 7, 7th Edition, 1935.

Mahāsaighika Prātimokṣa Sūtra, Ed. W.Pachow and R. Mishra, Gangānath Jhā Research Institute, Allahabad, 1956.

Mahīśāsaka Vinaya: Preserved in Chinese.

Māōūkya Upaniṣad, Ed. V.G.Āpte, Poona, 1928.

Manusmṛti, with Comy. of Medhātithi, Ed. G.Jhā, 3 Vols., Calcutta, 1932 - 39. Tr. G. Buhler, *The Laws of Manu*, SBE. 25, Oxford, 1886.

Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa Sūtra, Ed. A.C.Banerjee, IHQ. Vol. 29. pp.162 - 74, 266 - 75, 363 - 77.

Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya: prserved in Sanskrit, Gilgit MSS.

Bibliography

Taisho Issaikyo, Chinese Tripiṅka, Ed. J.Takakusu and K. Watanabe.

Taittirīya Upaniṣad, with Comy. of ṅaikara, Ed. V.G.Āpte, ASS. 12, 4th Edition, 1922.

Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, with Comy. of ṅaikara, Ed. V.G. Āpte, Poona, 1925.

Praśna Upaniṣad, Ed. V.G. Āpte, Poona,1922.

Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa Sūtra, Ed. M. Finot, Journal Asiatique, 1913.

Srīmadbhagavadgītārthaparakāsikā, Ed. Pandits of the Adyar Library, Series No. 25,1941.

Upaniṣads: The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, Tr. R.E.Hume, Second Edition, OUP, 1934.

II SECONDARY AUTHORITIES

Altekar, A.S., *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization*, Banaras Hindu University, 1956.

Basham, A.L. *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*, London, 1951.

Belvalkar, S.K. and Ranade, R.D., *History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol.2, Poona, 1927.

Bhabavat, Durga N., *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, Poona, 1940.

Bloomfield, M., *Atharvaveda*, Strassburg, 1899.

Bode, Mabel Haynes, *The Pali Literature of Burma*, RAS. London, 1909.

Deo, S.B., *History of Jaina Monachism*, Poona, 1956.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, *Early Monastic Buddhism*, New Edition, Calcutta, 1960.

Dutt, Sukumar, *Buddha and Five After-Centuries*, London, 1959. *Early Buddhist Monachism*, First Published 1924. First Indian Edition (revised) 1960.

Eliot, Sir Charles, *Japanese Buddhism*, London, 1935.

Horner, I.B., *Women Under Primitive Buddhism*, London, 1930.

'*Abhidhamma Abhivinaya*', IHQ. Vol. 17, pp. 291 - 310.

Bibliography

Law, B.C., *A. History of Pali Literature*, 2 Vols., London, 1933. (Ed.)
Buddhistic Studies, Calcutta, 1931.

Malalasekera. G.P., *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, RAS. London, 1928.

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier, *Buddhism*, London, 1889.

Nagai, M., '*Buddhist Vinaya Discipline*' in *Buddhistic Studies*, Ed.
B.C.Law, Calcutta, 1931, pp. 365 - 82.

Oldenberg, H., *Buddha*, Tr. Hoey, London and Edinburgh, 1882;
Calcutta, 1927.

Prabhu, Pandhari-Nath, *Hindu Social Organization*, New Revised
Edition, Bombay, 1954.

Rahula, Walpola, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1956.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F., *Buddhism*, Home University Library of Modern
Knowledge, London, 1912. Revised Edition, 1934. *Outlines of
Buddhism: a historical sketch*, Methuen & Co., London, 1934.
Sakya or Buddhist Origins, London, 1931.

Rhys Davids, T.W., *Buddhism*, Non- Christian Religious Systems,
London, Revised Edition, 1886. New and Revised Edition, 1907.
Buddhism, its History and Literature (American Lectures on the
History of Religions), 1896.

Taw Sein Ko, '*Preliminary Study of the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of
Dhammaceti. 1476 A.D.*' in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 22. pp. 11- 17.

Thomas, E.J. *The History of Buddhist Thought*, London, 1933.

Bibliography

Winternitz, M., *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. 2. University of Calcuta, 1933.

Index

A

Abbhāna, 373
Abhidhamma, 42, 191, 445, 596
abhidhamme, 36, 444
abhijjhā, 183, 221, 224, 225
Abhisamācārika, 173, 175, 176,
178
abhivinaye, 36, 444
abrahamacariyā veramaṇī, 281
abrahamacariyavāsa, 82
abrogation, 302, 490
absolution, 5, 333, 341, 344, 345,
346, 347, 413, 554
Ācāraṅga Sūtra, 472
Ācariya, 441, 443, 444, 446, 448,
450
Acela Kassapa, 387
Act of Banishment, 396
Adhikaraṇasamatha, 409, 411,
417, 422, 428, 520
adhīpaññā sikkhā, 223
Adhiṭṭhāna, 357
Ādibrahmacariyika, 175, 176, 178
ādīkammika, 533
administration, 26, 28, 54, 155,
273, 354, 413, 453, 466, 483,

580

āgatānāgata, 27
Aggañña, 90
Aggika Jaṭila, 383
āhāre paṭikkūlasaññā, 198
Ajātasatthu, 334
Ājīvaka, 86
ājīvapārisuddhi, 182, 204, 207,
291
Ājīvapārisuddhisīla, 204, 208, 219,
291
ājīvavipatti, 206
Ākaṅkheyya, 141, 142, 302
Akaraṇīya, 279, 280, 554
akusala kamma, 170, 225
Alagaddūpama, 473
Ālāra Kālāma, 18, 81
Altekar, 460, 462, 463, 596
Amarapura, 585, 587, 588
amends, 334, 354, 355, 356, 358,
377, 382, 505, 553
amṛtatva, 68
Amūlḥavinaya, 407, 413, 424
āṇā pātimokkha, 534, 545
anādinavadasso, 151, 152, 154
Anāgāmin, 227, 288
anagāriya, 246

Index

- anāgatabhayāni*, 246, 252
Ānanda, xii, 82, 200, 232, 303,
308, 311, 431, 477, 488, 489,
491, 492, 493, 504, 540, 555,
557, 559, 560, 561, 566
Ānandattherauposathapañhavatth
u, 157, 540
Anaṅgana, 249, 250, 436, 440
anāsakāyana, 75
Andhakavinda, 575
Aniyata, 254, 498
aññatitthiyapubba, 386, 389
antevāsī, 444
Anumāna, 229, 437
anupādā parinibbānattham, 116
Anurādha, 108
Anuruddha, 400
Anuvādādhikaraṇa, 362
aparihāniya dhamma, 555
apaṭicchanna, 369, 370
Āpattādhikaraṇa, 362, 410, 422,
425, 428
Āpatti, 343, 347, 362
appamaññā, 84
Arahant, 91, 117, 120, 288, 290
Arahantship, 92, 101, 119, 139,
141, 179, 200, 212, 223, 226,
228, 242, 477
arahattaphala, 16
āraññaka, 250, 252, 576
araññakatta, 238
araṇyāyana, 75
arati, 100, 101, 102, 190
Ariṭṭha, 267, 406, 473, 502
ariyamagga, 84
Ariyapariyesana, 111
ariyavaṃsā, 189
asādhāraṇa paññatti, 499, 527
āsavānaṃ khaya, 88, 116
āsavānaṃ khayattham, 116
ascetic, 242, 248, 386, 462, 513,
515
asceticism, 11, 17, 75, 83, 132,
248, 251
Asoka, 28
Assaji, 110, 111, 196, 405, 429
Assaji and Punabbasu, 196, 405
Assalāyana, 82
Āṭānāṭiya, 231
Atharvan, 71, 79
Ātman, 73
Aṭṭhakanāgara, 104
Aṭṭhakathācariyā, 328
austerities, 17, 25, 83, 85, 88,
132, 134, 135
āvāsa, 25, 29, 572

Index

B

- bāhusaccamahatta*, 159
Bahavedaniya, 399
Balapitimodara, 584, 585, 586
ballot, 418
Bandhumafī, 537
Basham, 82, 596
Baudhāyana, 72
Belvalkar, 66, 67, 73, 75, 596
Bhaddāli, 32, 149, 150, 156, 158,
160, 164, 193, 196, 312
Bhagavadgītā, 89, 460, 594
Bhāradvājagotta, 88
Bhayabherava, 236, 239, 429
Bhikkhu Pātimokkha, 367, 483,
497, 499, 524, 527
Bhikkhu Saṅgha, 434, 480, 484,
485, 491, 493
Bhikkhu Sāsana, 505
bhikkhumānatta, 382
Bhikkhunī, xi, 38, 41, 367, 434,
478, 479, 480, 483, 488, 490,
491, 493, 496, 498, 503, 505,
507, 508, 509, 512, 514, 515,
516, 518, 524, 527
Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, xi, 367,
498, 505, 509, 514, 516, 518,
524, 527
Bhikkhunī Sāsana, 479, 483, 488,
491, 493, 496
Bhikkhunovādaka, 522
bhojane mattaññutā, 192, 194,
197, 199, 200
Bodhisatta, 81, 107, 108, 109,
112, 121, 126, 133, 239
boycott, 366, 406, 502, 505
Brahma, 16, 73, 74, 77, 79, 86,
87, 89, 91, 92, 95, 97, 99, 100,
102, 104, 294
Brahmā, 94, 100, 537
brahmabhūta, 88, 89, 90, 92
brahmabhūya, 89
Brahmacārī, 2
Brahmacariya, 115, 116
brahmacariyassa kevalī, 118
brahmacarya, 2, 66, 67, 68, 70,
71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80
Brahmajāla, 205, 207
Brahman, 70, 86, 88, 89
brāhmaṇa, 26, 88, 93, 239, 306,
311, 429, 435
Brahmanic, 62, 67, 69, 70, 87
Brahmanism, 2, 95
brahmapatti, 88, 92
brahmasaṃstha, 68
Brahmin, 69, 71, 77, 82, 89, 93,
96, 97, 137, 236, 307, 311, 429
Brahmin Sages, 82

Index

Buddhaghosa, 9, 41, 61, 83, 85,
87, 141, 144, 145, 151, 153,
164, 171, 175, 176, 177, 181,
189, 193, 198, 202, 204, 206,
208, 209, 210, 213, 216, 218,
222, 228, 291, 324, 327, 349,
363, 365, 366, 369, 370, 387,
389, 425, 427, 445, 509, 520,
521, 523, 524, 527, 541, 542,
553, 562, 565, 567, 581, 591,
593

Buddhas, 109, 157, 160, 189,
195, 233, 236, 537, 540, 541,
543, 544

Burma, 581, 582, 583, 585, 586,
596

C

Cakkavatti, 172

Canonical, 5, 7, 21, 36, 38, 55,
117, 144, 167, 182, 189, 191,
198, 209, 211, 213, 214, 215,
219, 258, 261, 304, 326, 327,
529, 536, 541, 568

Cātuddisa Saṅgha, 25, 29, 48

catupaccaya, 23, 187, 190

catuparisā, 495

Catupārisuddhisīla, 202, 209, 211,
213, 218, 219, 221

Catur Āśrama Dharma, 69, 70, 75

causal genesis, 107, 110, 111

cauyāma saṃvara, 476

celibacy, 11, 76, 84, 121, 123,
130, 152, 172, 280, 281, 283,
473

cenobitic, 14

cetaso āvaraṇa, 224

Cetokhila, 100

Ceylonese, 28, 581, 585

Chabbaggiya, 150, 455, 504, 551,
562, 567

Chain of Causation, 107, 111

chandapārisuddhi, 328

Channa, 406, 432

Chapaṭa, 581

chastity, 73, 84, 186, 281, 385,
476, 499

China, 582

Chinese, 56, 64, 259, 351, 352,
479, 489, 490, 491, 493, 534,
559, 561, 582, 593, 594, 595

Citta, 288, 289, 405

cittaklesa, 224

code, 39, 42, 45, 46, 47, 63, 64,
125, 135, 141, 169, 171, 172,
202, 209, 211, 217, 254, 256,
257, 259, 262, 263, 264, 275,
299, 302, 309, 316, 317, 318,

Index

332, 346, 367, 369, 395, 451,
463, 479, 485, 497, 499, 508,
538, 549, 553, 555
codified, 35, 176, 178, 203, 207,
254, 277, 282, 555
Commentaries, 5, 7, 55, 91, 101,
118, 119, 126, 194, 281, 532
Commentator, 10, 162
conceal, 335, 338, 371, 488
conduct, 15, 17, 32, 33, 35, 37,
48, 61, 122, 133, 135, 143,
147, 172, 174, 180, 233, 246,
273, 283, 298, 315, 317, 355,
356, 360, 377, 381, 383, 385,
388, 405, 408, 417, 437, 439,
441, 452, 454, 456, 467, 487,
497, 500, 512, 522, 550, 555,
612
confess, 331, 332, 341, 342, 347,
353, 371
confession, 17, 46, 47, 263, 332,
333, 334, 341, 343, 344, 346,
347, 353, 359, 370
confessional meeting, 45, 47, 257,
318
court, 30
Cūlābhaya, 214, 216
Cūladukkhakkhandha, 127
Culladhammasamādāna, 476

Cullavagga, 38, 41, 42, 51, 338,
342, 345, 350, 368, 369, 371,
375, 395, 396, 489, 524, 529,
532, 536, 541, 557, 568
Cullavedalla, 116
Cunda, 231, 431, 495

D

Dabbamallaputta, 456
dāna, 84
daṇḍakamma, 377, 410, 411, 421,
422, 424, 451
Dantabhūmi, 145
Dengyo Daishi, 583
Devadatta, 24, 132, 232, 248,
295, 334, 456, 504
dhammabhūta, 90
Dhammaceti, 582, 597
Dhammacetiya, 3, 128
Dhammālaṅkāra, 584
dhammanetti, 423
Dhānañjāni, 95, 97
Dharma, 15, 67, 70, 562
Dharma Piṭaka, 562
Dharmagupta Vinaya, 479, 490,
493
dharmaskandha, 66, 67, 68, 75
Dīpavaṃsa, 563
Dīpavihāra, 213

Index

dispute, 302, 400, 416, 423, 491,
580, 583, 585

dissentient, 25, 489

divine, 8, 16, 62, 97, 531

Dodanduwa, 586

dosa, 78, 100, 103, 128, 154, 225,
226, 227

Dubbhāsita, 162, 567

duggati, 8, 9, 221

Dukkaṭa, 162, 165, 206, 289, 327,
454, 455, 566, 570

dukkha, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112,
114, 115, 117, 175, 178, 184

duṭṭhullā āpatti, 371, 515

Dvedhāvitakka, 431

E

Egypt, 13

Eightfold Path, 119

ekāvāsa, 329

Ekavihāriya, 241

ekuposatha, 577

enlightenment, 16, 18, 60, 81, 83,
88, 99, 106, 117, 126, 132,

156, 161, 163, 198, 496

eremetical, 19, 20, 22, 24

ethical, 68, 72, 78, 228, 403, 489

etymology, 5

Europe, 13

exclusion, 48, 64, 225, 339, 341,
359, 532, 536

exoneration, 413

F

faith, 3, 45, 53, 120, 129, 167,
264, 320, 384, 387, 391, 394,
436

First Council, 37, 41, 264, 302,
491, 520, 521, 523, 524, 557,
558, 563, 565

food, 22, 24, 83, 85, 129, 135,
137, 187, 190, 192, 193, 194,
196, 197, 204, 206, 209, 216,
247, 249, 250, 252, 274, 406,
501, 513, 514, 517

G

gāmakkhetta, 309, 321

gāmantavihāra, 250

garudhamma, 434, 451, 482, 483,
488

genealogical tree, 2

Gopakamoggallāna, 4, 21, 29,
305, 311, 312, 321, 322, 372,
430, 571, 576

Gotama, 12, 16, 17, 20, 29, 81,
109, 157, 160, 296, 540, 541,
544

Index

guidance, 72, 76, 145, 156, 158,
163, 169, 172, 206, 247, 255,
275, 281, 291, 311, 314, 432,
435, 437, 438, 446, 490, 565
guilt, 46, 150, 154, 332, 333, 334,
335, 339, 340, 341, 343, 344,
345, 346, 347, 353, 358, 364,
368, 413, 416, 422, 533, 554,
556
guiltless, 413
guilty, 64, 154, 289, 300, 307,
322, 323, 332, 337, 338, 339,
340, 342, 346, 347, 350, 352,
355, 357, 359, 368, 371, 373,
375, 378, 381, 397, 410, 413,
424, 433, 451, 455, 487, 491,
501, 503, 515, 529, 530, 531,
532, 534, 535, 536, 544, 553
gūḷhaka, 418
Gulissāni, 22

H

heaven, 8, 79, 461, 466
hell, 86
heresy, 364, 365, 377, 406, 451,
502
heretic, 373, 383, 504
Hieizan, 583
Hume, 73, 74, 75, 87, 595

husband, 461, 462, 467

I

immortality, 62, 68
Indra, 77
Indriyabhāvanā, 431
indriyagutti, 219
indriyaśaṃvara, 183, 185, 186,
191, 192, 200, 202, 218
Indriyaśaṃvarasīla, 204, 219
indriyesu guttadvāro, 143, 144,
181, 191, 192, 201
institution, 11, 67, 69, 70, 71, 76,
80, 149, 157, 231, 255, 306,
315, 318, 354, 453, 465, 475,
477, 480, 487, 491, 495, 512,
539, 575
Interrogatory Portions, 46
intoxicants, 170, 281
inviolable, 171, 172, 552
Isipatana, 113
iṣṭam, 75

J

Jāgara, 586, 587, 588
jāgariyānuyoga, 192, 199
Jaina, 25, 320, 472, 473, 475,
476, 594, 596
Jainism, 56, 123, 462, 472, 475

Index

Jānussoni, 236, 238
Japan, 283, 582, 583
Jaṭilas, 81
Jīvaka, 100

K

Kaidan, 582
Kaidan Shiki, 583
Kakacūpama, 103, 148, 150, 173,
193, 311, 408, 439, 480, 549
Kakusandha, 109, 543
Kāla, 126
kāma, 102, 123, 185, 473
Kāma, 113
kāmbhogī, 124
kāmacchanda, 224, 225, 227
kāmarāga, 225, 227
kamma, 364, 365, 397, 398, 403,
404, 457, 534
Kammakkhandhaka, 395
kammapatha, 170
Kaṇḍaka, 500
Kanjin, 582, 583
Kassapa, 18, 81, 109, 157, 233,
432, 543, 566, 593
Kassapagotta, 547
kaṭhina ubbhāra, 300
kāyavūpakatṭha, 232
Khaggavisāṇa, 18, 23, 188, 224

Khandhakas, 41, 48, 50, 51, 58,
175, 176, 177, 300, 338, 362,
374, 376, 383, 384, 387, 388,
391, 395, 406, 416, 421, 422,
424, 440, 441, 443, 446, 449,
452, 521, 523, 529, 535, 568,
569, 581

khuddakāpatti, 162

khuddānukhuddaka, 552, 553,
556, 566

Kiccādhikaraṇa, 362

Kimbila, 400

Kiṭṭāgiri, 196, 405, 457

Kokālika, 457, 504

komārabrahmacariya, 71

Konāgamana, 543

Koravya, 131

Kosala Saṃyutta, 461

Kosambi, 400, 591

Kukkuravatika, 386

L

lābhaggamahatta, 159

laity, 49, 281, 320, 558, 585, 588

Laṭṭukipoma, 193, 196, 546, 549

law, 3, 5, 30, 31, 32, 35, 46, 49,
63, 95, 254, 261, 268, 276,
277, 282, 307, 312, 317, 323,
342, 345, 358, 368, 403, 408,

Index

455, 486, 502, 513, 522, 547,
549, 555, 566
lawlessness, 156, 551
laxity, 149, 246, 247, 253, 556,
563
layman, 8, 129, 147, 171, 281,
288, 321, 465
laywoman, 465, 466
leadership, 63, 308, 312, 379,
429, 435, 441, 446, 480, 482,
488
legal, 32, 52, 58, 63, 150, 154,
155, 165, 204, 260, 264, 268,
273, 276, 277, 280, 294, 295,
346, 362, 396, 398, 413, 433,
483
legislation, 61, 63, 156, 165, 272,
330, 339, 401, 406, 433, 491,
544, 549, 575, 579
litigiousness, 403
lobha, 128, 225, 226
Lomahaṃsana Jātaka, 85

M

Macchikāsaṇḍa, 289
Mādugaṅga, 584
Magadha, 313
Māgandīya, 386
Māgha, 104

Mahā Kassapa, 21, 22, 157, 188,
191, 200, 232, 236, 237, 253,
261, 302, 432, 435, 437, 504,
521, 549, 558, 562, 565, 566,
575
Mahāassapura, 116, 141
Mahāaṭṭhakathā, 126
Mahācattārisaka, 205
Mahādukkhakkhandha, 114
Mahāhatthipadopama, 112
Mahaka, 289
Mahānāma, 303
Mahānidāna, 112
Mahāpadāna, 44, 109, 157, 160,
318, 537, 539, 540, 542
Mahāparinibbāna, 311, 386, 496,
555, 556, 557, 568
Mahārāhulovāda, 101
Mahāsakuludāyī, 304, 321, 577
Mahāsaṅghika, 56, 58, 383, 536,
560, 561, 562, 567
Mahāsīhanāda, 83, 85
mahatta, 158
Mahāvaccagotta, 123, 386
Mahāvagga, 7, 28, 38, 47, 51, 81,
257, 258, 277, 312, 314, 316,
319, 320, 321, 324, 325, 329,
332, 333, 336, 338, 339, 346,
347, 348, 349, 351, 353, 357,

Index

- 500, 570, 572, 576, 580
Mahāvibhaṅga, 38, 262, 520
Mahāvīra, 476
Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, 259, 352,
490, 492, 493, 594
majjhīmasāla, 146
Makhādeva, 99, 131
Makkhali Gosāla, 82
Malalasekera, 582, 597
Mānatta, 369, 371, 373, 374, 375,
377, 382, 395, 478, 534
mānattacārika, 375, 377
Mandiyaputta, 182
manoduccarita, 221
manokamma, 221, 225
manosucarita, 221
Manusmṛti, xiii, 69, 460, 594
Māra, 133, 195, 467, 468, 471,
493, 496
mātikā, 42, 264
mauna, 75
Max Muller, 1
Medhātithi, 69, 70, 71, 594
mendicancy, 1, 10, 11, 18, 60, 81,
125, 131
mendicants, 12, 137, 319, 320,
321, 476, 499
mental, 98, 102, 103, 104, 134,
135, 172, 184, 187, 193, 199,
200, 218, 223, 224, 226, 413,
424, 473
methuna, 121, 281
methunavirati, 84
Metta, 104
mettā, 97, 103, 104
Mettiyabhummajaka, 456
micchādīṭṭhi, 221, 225, 228
micchājīva, 205, 207
Middle Path, 226
Milinda, 212, 520, 563, 564, 591
minor rules, 58, 165, 206, 302,
490, 550, 554, 563, 565, 566,
567, 568
miraculous, 286, 288, 289
missioner, 14
Moggallāna, 22, 81, 436, 437,
440, 458, 503, 531, 532, 535
moha, 78, 100, 103, 128, 225,
226, 227
mohakkhaya, 228
mokṣa, 108
Moliyaphagguna, 408, 504
monasteries, 10, 19, 406, 572
Monier Williams, 1, 2, 11, 16, 17
moral, 17, 68, 72, 74, 87, 90, 172,
180, 211, 228, 256, 276, 277,
285, 293, 299, 363, 396, 414,
463, 466, 473, 479, 485, 487,

Index

488, 489
morality, 48, 84, 93, 98, 119, 157,
176
mother, 461, 462, 470
muditā, 97, 101
Mūlasarvāstivāda, 335, 351, 382,
530, 531, 594
Mūlasarvāstivādins, 372, 530,
531, 536
murder, 49

N

Nagai, 282, 283, 592, 597
Nāgasena, 144, 145, 212, 563,
564, 565, 566

Ñ

ñāṇadassanatthaṃ, 116

N

Nanda, 232
Nandaka, 434
Nandiya, 400
Nara, 583
nemantanika, 251
Nhātakamuni, 241
nibbāna, 97, 106, 109, 111, 116,
119, 199, 226, 435
nibbānapariyāya, 223

Nigaṇṭhanātaputta, 398
nirodha, 107
Nissaggiya, xi, 254, 296, 297,
300, 301, 508, 509, 510, 517
nissaya, 22, 446
Nissaya kamma, 396
nissayadāyaka, 448
nīvaraṇa, 183, 192, 223, 224, 225
nun, 477, 478, 507

O

offence, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154,
156, 162, 206, 208, 260, 271,
272, 275, 284, 288, 289, 290,
291, 295, 296, 300, 307, 310,
322, 323, 327, 330, 333, 337,
339, 341, 343, 345, 348, 353,
357, 364, 365, 368, 369, 370,
372, 373, 374, 378, 379, 380,
381, 406, 408, 412, 413, 422,
433, 451, 454, 455, 456, 483,
486, 488, 501, 502, 529, 531,
535, 570
offender, 150, 155, 298, 333, 334,
341, 343, 358, 364, 365, 368,
369, 371, 373, 375, 382, 405,
406, 410, 411, 422, 424
Oldenberg, 1, 7, 11, 19, 29, 30,
38, 39, 40, 43, 51, 52, 61, 255,

Index

256, 265, 266, 267, 273, 288,
333, 347, 357, 366, 381, 445,
563, 592, 593, 597
orambhāgiya saṃyojana, 227
ovāda, 435, 449, 541, 542, 544
ovāda pātimokkha, 541, 542, 544

P

Pabbājaniya kamma, 366, 396
pabbajīta, 15, 23, 102, 121, 124,
185, 230, 277, 292, 321
pabbajjā, 15, 16, 23, 24, 62, 115,
121, 124, 126, 127, 282, 388,
389, 391, 394, 474, 475, 477
Pabbajjā, 120, 274, 578
Paccayasannissitasīla, 204, 208,
219
Pācīnavamsadāya, 400
Pācittiya, xi, 150, 162, 164, 170,
197, 206, 254, 267, 268, 271,
272, 275, 281, 287, 291, 292,
296, 297, 298, 300, 301, 346,
364, 365, 371, 456, 483, 488,
500, 501, 502, 503, 506, 508,
509, 510, 513, 514, 515, 516,
548, 551, 554
Padhāna, 133
padhāniyaṅga, 7
Pakudha Kaccāyana, 82
paṃsukūlacīvara, 248
paṃsukūlika, 250, 252
pañcanīvaraṇa, 98
pañcasikkhāpadasīla, 84
Paṅkadha, 547
paññā, 119, 134, 140, 177, 178,
218, 220
paññatto, 35, 389, 556
pantheistic, 87
Pārājika, xi, 151, 153, 156, 161,
162, 163, 166, 206, 254, 261,
266, 275, 276, 280, 282, 284,
285, 287, 290, 291, 322, 338,
341, 343, 357, 366, 367, 368,
371, 412, 416, 433, 456, 488,
499, 502, 505, 515, 521, 524,
527, 532, 552, 554
Paribbājaka, 82, 304, 386, 429
parinibbāna, 305, 496
paripucchā, 449
parisuddhājīvo, 143, 181, 191,
208
pārisuddhisīla, 211
Parivāra, 38, 206, 521, 523
Parivāsa, 370, 371, 373, 374, 375,
377, 383, 388, 395
parivāsika, 375
Parivrājakas, 18, 21, 37
pariyattisāsana, 122

Index

- Pāsādika, 123, 495
- Pasenadi Kosala, 3, 128, 232
- Paṭiccasamuppāda, 108, 112
paṭicchanna, 369
- Pāṭidesanīya, 206, 296, 297
- Pātimokkha-reciter, 324, 325, 330,
335, 351
- pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto*, 143,
145, 168, 180, 181, 191, 192,
215, 303
- Pātimokkhasaṃvarasīla, 202, 208,
216, 219
- Pātimokkhuddesa, 254, 305
- Pātimokkhuddesaka, 310
- Paṭiññātakaraṇa, 410, 422
paṭipattisāsana, 122
- Pavāraṇā, 265, 355, 356, 357,
358, 359, 360, 375, 379
- Pāveyyaka, 251
- penalty, 154, 322, 368, 369, 370,
371, 373, 374, 375, 377, 378,
380, 381, 412, 422
piṇḍapātika, 252
piṇḍiyālopabhojana, 248
- Posadha, 320
- Posadhasthāpanavastu, 335
- Prajāpati, 77
- Praśna Upaniṣad, xiii, 73, 595
- Prātimokṣasūtra, 352, 372, 382,
519
- preceptor, 377, 393
- probation, 373, 383, 384, 387,
388, 389
- procedure, 30, 58, 142, 247, 248,
274, 298, 315, 326, 356, 363,
367, 369, 371, 395, 408, 419,
422, 424, 427, 479, 481, 484,
513, 532, 548, 581
- property, 26, 27, 281, 300
- propriety, 174, 180, 194, 246, 274,
298, 441, 443, 473, 479, 548,
551
- prosecution, 63, 150, 155, 260,
275, 323, 336, 363, 381, 398,
403, 411, 535, 550
pubbakaraṇa, 354
pubbakicca, 328, 348, 354
- punish, 308, 353, 411
- punishment, 46, 63, 153, 165,
256, 260, 275, 298, 323, 332,
335, 346, 366, 372, 373, 374,
377, 381, 395, 397, 403, 404,
410, 412, 421, 452, 454, 502
- Puṇṇa Mantāniputta, 119
puṇyaloka, 66, 67
- pupil, 175, 237, 442, 445, 446,
448, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454
- Purāṇa, 568

Index

Pūraṇa Kassapa, 82

purity, 206, 210, 211, 291, 306,
315, 322, 326, 330, 332, 337,
340, 341, 348, 349, 350, 351,
355, 359, 425, 426, 427, 533,
570

pūtimuttabhesajja, 248

Q

quarrel, 380, 381

R

Rādha, 28

rāga, 78, 100, 103, 199, 225, 226,
227

Rājagaha, 288, 572, 575

Rāmānuja, 76

rattaññumahatta, 159

Ratṭhapāla, 131

rebellious, 150, 155, 196, 342,
455, 505, 507, 546, 554

recital, 29, 41, 42, 45, 47, 54, 64,
254, 255, 256, 257, 259, 260,
264, 301, 302, 304, 305, 311,
312, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319,
321, 323, 324, 325, 327, 328,
330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 337,
338, 339, 340, 342, 343, 344,
346, 347, 348, 349, 351, 352,

353, 357, 358, 359, 425, 426,
427, 524, 526, 530, 531, 532,
533, 534, 536, 537, 538, 539,
540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 550,
552, 554, 568, 573, 574, 577

recluseship, 8, 13, 127, 389

regulation, 31, 147, 149, 170, 204,
276, 440, 498

renunciation, 14, 23, 76, 120, 124,
125, 127, 130, 152, 230, 282,
321, 474, 476

residence, 17, 22, 29, 190, 235,
236, 240, 247, 250, 252, 274,
328, 376, 397, 405, 423, 442,
448, 452, 478, 482, 532, 571,
572, 573, 575, 576, 577, 578

restraint, 17, 87, 93, 98, 145, 167,
183, 184, 186, 199, 281, 302,
345, 538

rhinoceros, 22, 189

Rhys Davids, 1, 4, 7, 12, 13, 14,
15, 19, 29, 38, 40, 43, 49, 50,
52, 112, 143, 257, 261, 333,
520, 564, 590, 591, 592, 593,
597

Ritsu, 582

ritual, 39, 44, 45, 65, 157, 160,
215, 257, 301, 304, 305, 312,
313, 315, 321, 322, 324, 328,

Index

329, 333, 339, 341, 342, 344,
346, 347, 348, 353, 355, 356,
357, 360, 425, 426, 428, 497,
526, 529, 536, 550, 554, 570,
572, 573, 575
ritualistic, 68, 95, 304, 319, 329,
341, 343, 350, 354, 359, 360,
574, 575, 581, 582
rukkhamūlasenāsana, 248

S

Sabbāsava, 209
sadārasantosa, 84
saddhā, 56, 125, 139, 218, 232,
429, 466, 495
saddhamma, 203
saddhivihārī, 444
Sakadāgāmin, 227
sakalabrahmacārī, 118
sakaṇṇajappaka, 418
sakkāyadiṭṭhi, 226, 227
Sakuludāyī, 304
salākagāhāpaka, 418
Sallekha, 222, 229, 431
samādhī, 119, 140, 144, 177, 178,
220, 286
Sāmagāma, 398, 400, 421
samaṇa, 141, 535
samānasaṃvāsa, 577

sāmaṇera, 169, 171, 378, 384,
388, 394, 500
sāmaṇerapabbajjā, 394
samatha, 234, 410
Samathakkhandhaka, 407
Sammādiṭṭhi, 108
sammappadhāna, 7, 144
Sammukhāvinaya, 407, 410, 416,
422
Samodhānaparivāsa, 374
sampannapātimokkha, 7
sampannasīla, 214
saṃsāra, 70, 88, 117, 185, 474
samsāric, 111
samudaya, 107
samyagñāna, 73
saṃyojana, 224, 226, 227
Saṃyutta Nikāya, 9, 102, 122,
144, 157, 161, 215, 231, 233,
289, 387, 388, 432, 463, 467,
592
Sandaka, 82
Sandha, 235
Saṅgha Rāja, 585
Saṅghādisesa, xi, 156, 161, 162,
163, 206, 254, 266, 294, 295,
296, 301, 338, 341, 358, 368,
369, 370, 372, 373, 381, 403,
408, 416, 432, 437, 450, 456,

Index

- 488, 500, 501, 505, 507, 515,
519, 526, 527, 551
saṅghamānatva, 382
Saṅghasthavira, 530, 531, 534
Saṅgīti, 97, 189, 261, 568
Saṅjaya, 18, 82
Śaṅkara, 67, 68, 75, 76, 77
Sannyāsī, 2
santutthī, 182, 219
Sappadāsa, 128
Sāratthadīpanī, 162, 163, 592
Sāriputta, 22, 81, 83, 96, 97, 108,
112, 119, 157, 160, 163, 315,
429, 436, 440, 458, 503, 543,
592
Sarvāstivādins, 58, 519, 560
Sāsana, 6, 7, 19, 20, 28, 33, 39,
46, 48, 56, 57, 63, 148, 163,
164, 169, 175, 203, 236, 246,
247, 252, 306, 312, 346, 366,
391, 402, 408, 430, 432, 434,
437, 439, 442, 445, 446, 453,
455, 479, 484, 488, 489, 492,
493, 498, 500, 504, 539, 541,
544, 546, 551, 556, 558, 562,
570, 572, 581, 589
Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 320
satī, 96, 107, 110, 218
satisampajañña, 98, 182, 191,
192, 199, 200
Sativinaya, 407, 413, 425
sattabbhantara, 577
sattrāyaṇa, 75
Second Buddhist Council, 263
Sekha, 144, 168
sekha dhamma, 177
sekhapaṇṇatti, 177
Sekhiya, xi, 58, 255, 518
Sekhiyadhamma, 206
Seniya, 313, 386
Seniya Bimbisāra, 313
sensual, 60, 124, 128, 133, 135,
185, 476
settha, 87
sex, 121, 281, 462, 463, 469, 473,
497, 499, 500, 505, 511, 512
Seyyasaka, 405
Shinran, 283
Shinshū, 283
Shosho shonin, 583
Siddhatta, 81
Sikhī, 129, 543
sikkhā, 35, 119, 139, 140, 142,
173, 174, 177, 178, 180, 220,
444, 558
sikkhāpada, 32, 46, 55, 149, 150,
151, 153, 155, 156, 160, 163,
164, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172,

Index

- 173, 175, 178, 180, 197, 203,
205, 206, 254, 255, 256, 257,
258, 259, 263, 265, 266, 274,
275, 276, 280, 285, 287, 288,
292, 293, 296, 299, 301, 302,
305, 307, 310, 312, 314, 317,
318, 331, 425, 426, 427, 428,
478, 483, 486, 498, 499, 502,
503, 506, 510, 512, 514, 519,
520, 522, 524, 526, 533, 541,
543, 544, 547, 550, 551, 552,
553, 554, 556, 559, 566
- sīla*, 7, 9, 32, 119, 121, 140, 142,
144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150,
152, 153, 167, 169, 172, 173,
175, 177, 178, 180, 182, 184,
191, 192, 197, 200, 202, 204,
205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 213,
214, 215, 218, 220, 221, 223,
247, 254, 256, 274, 275, 276,
277, 280, 281, 292, 293, 301,
302, 321, 444, 466, 538
- sīlakkhandha*, 98, 146, 218
- sīlaratana*, 212
- sīlasampanna*, 303
- sīlavā*, 145, 146, 168, 181, 192,
215, 303, 464
- Sīmālaṅkāraṇadīpanī, 588
- Sīmālaṅkāra, 581
- Sīmālaṅkārapakaraṇa, 582
- Sīmānayadappana, 584, 588
- sīmantarikā*, 580
- Sīmāsaṅkarachedanī, 582
- sinehadosa*, 224
- society, 25, 30, 64, 93, 130, 138,
229, 275, 460, 461, 463, 465,
499, 506, 612
- solitary, 17, 18, 21, 23, 122, 127,
230, 232, 234, 250, 261, 357,
431
- solitude, 22, 83, 234, 236, 247,
304
- Somā, 468
- Sotāpatti, 226, 227
- spiritual, 8, 12, 13, 16, 21, 29, 63,
66, 69, 92, 100, 102, 122, 127,
129, 136, 139, 140, 142, 145,
146, 147, 148, 155, 166, 167,
176, 178, 180, 182, 190, 191,
193, 194, 197, 200, 206, 208,
222, 223, 226, 230, 234, 236,
239, 240, 243, 251, 286, 288,
294, 311, 333, 337, 430, 435,
440, 441, 445, 446, 449, 450,
452, 460, 467, 468, 469, 474,
475, 480
- śramaṇa*, 12
- Srimadbhagavadgītārthaprakāśikā

Index

, 90
strife, 396, 398, 399, 587
student, 15, 79, 321
studentship, 69, 72, 76
Subhadda, 37, 386, 546
suddhi, 219
Sudhamma, 405
Sudinna, 151, 152, 153, 282
sugati, 8, 9
suicide, 129, 275
Sumana, 213
Suspension of the Pātimokkha,
 338, 342, 529, 532, 535, 536,
 538, 541
sutta, 4, 42, 54, 260, 264
Sutta Piṭaka, 42, 54, 146, 280,
 312, 386, 395, 433, 438
Suttavibhaṅga, 32, 38, 39, 41, 42,
 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 58, 151,
 157, 159, 160, 164, 205, 208,
 256, 260, 265, 266, 268, 274,
 276, 280, 286, 315, 316, 317,
 366, 503, 544, 551, 569

T

Tajjaniya kamma, 395
Tālapuṭa, 243, 244
tapas, 68, 73, 75, 79, 88
Tārukkha, 96

Tassapāpiyyasikā, 407, 411, 424
Taw Sein Ko, 582, 597
teacher, 15, 17, 60, 69, 70, 72, 76,
 83, 90, 175, 213, 431, 441,
 445, 446, 448, 450, 451, 452,
 453, 454
tecattārīsavatta, 377
tecīvarikatta, 251
Tendai, 583
Tevijjā, 96, 98
theft, 49, 276, 277, 279, 280, 287,
 290
Theravādins, 57, 59, 475, 531,
 562
Theriya, 56, 58, 64, 350, 353, 372,
 489, 490, 492, 493, 530, 531,
 535, 536, 559, 562, 563, 565,
 567, 568, 581
Thomas, 1, 50, 51, 591, 597
Thullaccaya, 162, 163, 206, 208
Thullanandā, 502, 503
thullavajja, 416
Tiṇavatthāraka, 407, 414, 425
Tissametteyya, 121
tisso sikkhā, 140, 177, 178, 212
Titthiyaparivāsa, 373, 386, 388,
 395
traivedikaṃ vratam, 71
tutelage, 377, 405, 446, 450

Index

U

Ubbāhikā, 409
Ubhato Vibhaṅga, 176, 520
Ubhato Vinaya, 261
Udāyi, 196, 231, 549
Uddaka Rāmaputta, 18, 81
Uddesa, 42, 43, 45, 254, 256,
259, 260, 304, 317, 321
uddhambhāgiya saṃyojana, 227,
228
Udumbarikasīhanāda, 233
Ukkhepaniya kamma, 367, 377,
396
ukkhitta, 366
ukkhittānūvattikā, 502
Upajjhāya, 441, 443, 444, 446,
448
upakkilesa, 222, 224
upakurvāṇa, 69
Upāli, 238, 239, 261, 521, 561
Upaniṣadic, 67, 72, 75, 77, 86
uparibhāvapariyāya, 223
Upasampadā, 28, 247, 248, 274,
393, 552, 578, 583
upasampanna, 169, 279
Upasena Vaṅgantaputta, 236,
237, 301, 549, 555
upekkhā, 97, 104, 198
Uposatha, 45, 47, 256, 257, 265,

307, 314, 318, 320, 322, 327,
330, 333, 337, 338, 339, 340,
355, 357, 375, 379, 519, 526,
529, 535, 540, 550, 570, 572,
573, 575

uposathāgāra, 573

Uposathakamma, 329

Uposathakkhandhaka, 312, 351

uposathariga, 84

uposathapucchaka, 482

Uruvela Kassapa, 81

uttarimanussadhamma, 284, 286,
288

V

Vacchagotta, 386

Vācissara, 582

Vairocana, 77

Vajjiputtaka, 140, 169, 305, 550

Vakkali, 240

Vassakāra, 311

Vassāvāsa, 355

vassikasāṭṭika, 517

Vatthūpama, 194, 221, 225, 229

Veda, 71

Vedic, 2, 320, 321, 460

Velitota, 586

vepullamahatta, 159

Verañjā, 162, 163

Index

Vessabhū, 109, 543
Vessavaṇa, 231
veyyāvacca, 84
vijjāvimuttiphalasacchikiriyattham,
116
Vimalasāra, 584, 586, 587, 588
Vimuttimagga, 203, 219, 593
Vinayadhara, 522
vipassanā, 142, 234
Vipassi, 109, 157, 318, 537, 540,
542, 543
virāga, 285
virīya, 84, 85, 218
virtue, 7, 22, 23, 67, 76, 84, 100,
101, 103, 139, 180, 184, 186,
187, 194, 197, 199, 209, 211,
222, 232, 235, 249, 251, 272,
281, 302, 334, 433, 437, 439,
462, 463, 464, 466, 485

visaṃyoga, 285
Vivādādhikaraṇa, 362, 423
vote, 417, 419
Vrata, 320, 321
vyāpāda, 100, 221, 224, 225, 227

W

wife, 11, 13, 126, 462, 466, 467
Winternitz, 40, 50, 520, 598
woman, 460, 461, 462, 463, 465,
467, 468, 469, 470, 472, 474,
477, 497, 505

Y

yajña, 68, 75, 80
yasagga, 159
Yebhuyyasikā, 407, 414, 416, 423

BUDDHIST MONASTIC DISCIPLINE

Dr. Jotiya Dhirasekera

The Buddhist Monastic Order is the earliest corporate organisation in the world where within a framework of a flexible organisation there was evolved ancillary bodies, rules, regulations and codes of conduct of the most minute detail. Every aspect of a monk's life, living in society and together with other monks as well as nuns, has been gone into in the ancient texts. The author has brought to life the ancient organisational forms, rules and codes and the methods adopted to enforce them without the charge of tyranny being levelled against the Elders. He has shown how the Buddhist concept of ceaseless change has made inroads into the organisation and has been dextrously handled so as to safeguard the doctrine and the organisation.

The author draws extensively from the original ancient Pali, Sanskrit, and Chinese texts.

This book is felt to be of great value to students of Buddhism, students of Asian History and Indologists.

The book will be of value also to students of political theory whose sources have so far been confined to Greek, Roman and Sanskrit material. It throws new light on ancient Buddhist social organisation.